

# **FY2014 Food Aid Proposal Guidance**

## **Annex II**

# **Food for Progress and McGovern-Dole Standard and Illustrative Indicators and Definitions**

Food Assistance Division  
Office of Capacity Building and Development  
Foreign Agricultural Service  
U.S. Department of Agriculture

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

EXPLANATION OF TYPES OF INDICATORS .....	3
FOOD FOR PROGRESS FEED THE FUTURE REQUIRED INDICATORS .....	4
FOOD FOR PROGRESS FEED THE FUTURE INDICATOR DEFINITIONS .....	6
FOOD FOR PROGRESS STANDARD INDICATORS .....	25
FOOD FOR PROGRESS STANDARD INDICATOR DEFINITIONS.....	27
FOOD FOR PROGRESS ILLUSTRATIVE INDICATORS .....	43
FFP COMMON PHRASING FOR ACTIVITY INDICATORS .....	50
MCGOVERN-DOLE FEED THE FUTURE REQUIRED INDICATORS.....	52
MCGOVERN-DOLE FEED THE FUTURE INDICATOR DEFINITIONS.....	53
MCGOVERN-DOLE STANDARD INDICATORS .....	62
MCGOVERN-DOLE STANDARD INDICATOR DEFINITIONS .....	65
MCGOVERN-DOLE ILLUSTRATIVE INDICATORS.....	97
MGD COMMON PHRASING FOR ACTIVITY INDICATORS.....	103

# EXPLANATION OF TYPES OF INDICATORS

---

Throughout this proposal guidance document, FAS references four types of performance indicators: Feed the Future, standard, illustrative, and custom. FAS defines those terms as follows:

- 1) **Feed the Future indicators:** a common set of mandatory indicators identified by FAS that must be used by all program participants, if applicable to the project in order to report USDA's contribution to the Feed the Future initiative.
- 2) **Standard Indicators:** a common set of mandatory indicators identified by FAS that must be used by all program participants, if applicable to the project.
- 3) **Illustrative Indicators:** example indicators provided by FAS. These indicators are not mandatory.
- 4) **Custom Indicators:** additional performance indicators that are not included in FAS's list of standard indicators. These indicators can be drawn from or based upon FAS's list of illustrative indicators, although they do not have to be.

Applicants must use all applicable Feed the Future and standard indicators in their proposals. The Feed the Future and standard indicator definitions provided in this document should be used to inform the design of the PMP. It is not necessary to reproduce the entire indicator definition in your PMP document. Please refer to the Proposal Guidance document for more information on preparing a PMP.

Additionally, applicants may also choose to develop custom indicators because the FAS standard indicators alone do not adequately measure the results or activities to which they are linked. Applicants may design custom indicators using FAS's list of illustrative indicators as a guide, although this is not required.

Every performance indicator is either classified as an output or an outcome. FAS defines these terms as follows:

- 5) **Outputs:** the immediate and tangible results of a projects' inputs, such as number of children fed, number of schools built, number of trainings provided, etc. Outputs often are used to measure activities, but they sometimes are used to measure results.
- 6) **Outcomes:** the change effected as a result of the outputs. An outcome quantifies a level of performance or achievement. Outcomes are used to measure results.

Some standard indicators provided in this document are used to measure results, while some indicators are used to measure activity outputs that directly support results. The standard indicator definitions will note whether the indicator should measure an activity output or result.

# FOOD FOR PROGRESS FEED THE FUTURE REQUIRED INDICATORS

These indicators must be entered into agreements exactly as written

Result #	Indicator <sup>1</sup>	Unit
FTF 1	Number of hectares under improved techniques or technologies as a result of USDA assistance	Hectares
FTF 2	Number of farmers and others who have applied new techniques or technologies as a result of USDA assistance	Number
FTF 3	Number of individuals receiving short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training as a result of USDA assistance	Number
FTF 4	Value of agricultural and rural loans provided as a result of USDA assistance	US Dollars
FTF 5	Number of private enterprises, producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied new technologies or management practices as result of USDA assistance	Number
FTF 6	Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of USDA assistance	Number
FTF 7	Number of jobs attributed to USDA assistance	Number
FTF 8	Number of policies, regulations, and/or administrative procedures supporting improved industry standards prepared with USDA assistance passed/approved	Number
FTF 9	Kilometers of roads improved or constructed as a result of USDA assistance	Kilometers
FTF 10	Total increase in installed storage capacity (dry or cold storage) as a result of USDA assistance	Total cubic meters
FTF 11	Number of farmers and others who have applied improved farm management practices (i.e. governance, administration, or financial management)	Number

## FY2014 Food Aid Proposal Guidance: Annex II

FTF 12	Number of farmers and others who have received training on improved farm management practices (i.e. governance, administration, or financial management) as a result of USDA assistance	Number
FTF 13	Number of farmers and others using financial services as a result of USDA assistance	Number
FTF 14	Number of farmers and others who have received training on improved agricultural techniques and technologies as a result of USDA assistance	Number

<sup>1</sup>*Definitions of the Indicators are provided in the Food for Progress Feed the Future Indicator Definitions section below*

# FOOD FOR PROGRESS FEED THE FUTURE

## INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

All of the following indicators should be placed under the result entitled “Contributions to Feed the Future.”

**FTF INDICATOR 1:** Number of hectares under improved techniques or technologies as a result of USDA assistance

**DEFINITION:** This indicator measures the area (in hectares) of land or water (for fisheries) under new technique or technology during the current reporting year. Techniques or technologies to be counted here are agriculture-related technologies and innovations. Relevant techniques or technologies include:

- Mechanical and physical: Irrigation, new land preparation, harvesting and product handling technologies.
- Biological: new germ plasm (varieties, breeds, etc.) that could be higher-yielding or higher in nutritional content and/or more resilient to climate impacts; affordable food-based nutritional supplementation such as Vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, or high-protein maize, or improved livestock breeds; soil management practices that increase biotic activity and soil organic matter levels; and livestock health services and products such as vaccines;
- Chemical : Fertilizers, insecticides and pesticides safe storage application and disposal of agricultural chemicals, effluent and wastes, and soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiency (e.g. soil organic matter);
- Other, including management and cultural practices: Information technology, conservation agriculture, improved/sustainable agricultural production and marketing practices, increased use of climate information for planning disaster risk strategies in place, climate change mitigation and energy efficiency, and natural resources management practices that increase productivity (e.g. upstream watershed conservation) and/or resilience to climate change including soil and water conservation and management practices (e.g. erosion control, water harvesting, low or no-till); sustainable fishing practices (e.g. ecological fishery reserves, improved fishing gear, establishment of fishery management plans); Integrated Pest Management (IPM), and Integrated Soil Fertility Management (ISFM) related to agriculture should all be included as improved technologies or management practices.

**RATIONALE:** Tracks successful adoption of technologies and management practices in an effort to improve agricultural productivity, agricultural water productivity, sustainability, and resilience to climate impacts.

### INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT OF MEASURE:	INDICATOR LEVEL:	DIRECTION OF CHANGE:	FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:
Hectares	Outcome	Higher is better	Length of Project

**DISAGGREGATION:** NONE

**DATA SOURCE:**

WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Program Participants.

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected through interviews of program beneficiaries, direct observation of measures of land at the project level, farmer surveys, or through farmer associations, and should only be reported on hectares under improved techniques and technologies supported by USDA

**MEASUREMENT NOTES:** Significant improvements to existing technologies should be counted.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE		
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> Yes [4.5.2-2]	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> Yes	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> FtF frequency of reporting is annually. FtF includes management practices whereas FFPr has Indicator 3 for management practices. FtF includes storage and processing in this indicator whereas FFPr includes them in Results Framework 2.

<b>FTF 2: Number of farmers and others who have applied new techniques or technologies as result of USDA assistance</b>			
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> This indicator measures the total number of farmers, ranchers and other primary sector producers (food and non-food crops, livestock products, wild fisheries, aquaculture, and agro-forestry that applied new technologies anywhere within the food and fiber system as a result of USDA assistance.</p> <p>This includes innovations in efficiency, value-addition, on-farm post-harvest management, sustainable land management, forest, and water management. Technologies to be counted here are agriculture-related technologies and innovations. Relevant technologies include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mechanical and physical: New land preparation, irrigation, harvesting, and product handling technologies</li> <li>• Biological: new germ plasm (varieties, breeds, etc.) that could be higher-yielding or higher in nutritional content and/or more resilient to climate impacts; affordable food-based nutritional supplementation such as Vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, or high-protein maize, or improved livestock breeds; soil management practices that increase biotic activity and soil organic matter levels; and livestock health services and products such as vaccines;</li> <li>• Chemical Fertilizers; insecticides and pesticides safe storage application and disposal of agricultural chemicals, effluent and wastes, and soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiencies (e.g. soil organic matter);</li> <li>• Other practices, including cultural practices: conservation agriculture, improved/sustainable agricultural production and marketing practices, increased use of climate information for planning disaster risk strategies in place, climate change mitigation and energy efficiency, and natural resources management practices that increase productivity (e.g. upstream watershed conservation) and/or resilience to climate change including soil and water conservation and management practices (e.g. erosion control, water harvesting, low or no-till); sustainable fishing practices (e.g. ecological fishery reserves, improved fishing gear, establishment of fishery management plans); Integrated Pest Management (IPM), and Integrated Soil Fertility Management (ISFM) related to agriculture should all be included as improved techniques or technologies.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>RATIONALE:</b> Technological change and its adoption by different actors in the agricultural supply chain will be critical to increasing agricultural productivity which is the Intermediate Result under which this indicator falls. In addition, private sector and civil society behavior change leads to increased agricultural sector productivity.</p>			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Outcome	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Length of Project
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> NONE			
<p><b>DATA SOURCE:</b></p> <p>WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Program Participants.</p> <p>HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected via survey, observation, project or association records, or farm records of all targeted individuals</p>			
<p><b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> All significant improvements to existing techniques or technologies should be counted. This indicator counts individuals who applied new techniques or technologies, whereas indicator 10 counts firms, associations, or other group entities applying new technologies or management practices.</p>			



FY2014 Food Aid Proposal Guidance: Annex II

RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE		
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> Yes [4.5.2-5]	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> Yes	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b>

<b>FTF 3: Number of individuals receiving short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training as a result of USDA assistance</b>			
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> The number of individuals to whom significant knowledge or skills have been imparted through interactions that are structured and purposed for imparting knowledge or skills should be counted as training, through formal or informal means. Short-term includes all non-degree seeking training.</p> <p>Individuals include farmers, ranchers, fisheries, and other primary sector producers who receive training in a variety of best practices in productivity, post-harvest management, linking to markets, etc. It also includes rural entrepreneurs, processors, managers and traders receiving training in application of new technologies, business management, linking to markets, etc., and extension specialists, researchers, inspectors, government employees, policy makers, and others who are engaged in the food, feed and fiber system and natural resources management.</p> <p>In-country and offshore training are included. Delivery mechanisms can include a variety of extension methods as well as technical assistance activities.</p>			
<b>RATIONALE:</b> Enhanced human capacity for increased agriculture productivity, improved food security, policy formulation and/or implementation, is key to transformational development.			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Output	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Length of Project
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> NONE			
<p><b>DATA SOURCE:</b></p> <p>WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Program Participants.</p> <p>HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant training records, reports, or surveys. Program participants should keep detailed training lists for all training sessions.</p>			
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> Count only those individuals targeted by USDA programs.			
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>			
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> Yes [4.5.2-7]	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> FtF frequency of reporting is annually.	

<b>FTF 4: Value of agricultural and rural loans provided with USDA assistance</b>			
<b>DEFINITION:</b> This indicator adds the value of loans made (i.e. disbursed during the reporting year as a result of USDA assistance) to producers (farmers, fishers, etc.) input suppliers, transporters, processors, as well as loans to Micro (1-5), Small (6-50), and Medium (51-100) Enterprises (MSMEs) in rural areas that are in a targeted agricultural value chain as a result of USDA assistance. The indicator counts loans disbursed to the recipient, not loans merely made (e.g. in process, but not yet available to the recipient.) The loans can be made by any size financial institution from micro-credit through national commercial bank, and includes any type of micro-finance institution, such as an NGO.			
<b>RATIONALE:</b> Making more financial loans shows that there is improved access to business development and financial services. This, in turn, will help expand markets and trade and ought to also contribute to IR1's expanding agricultural productivity which will help achieve the key objective of inclusive agriculture sector being defined broader than just crop production. In turn, this contributes to both goals of reducing poverty and hunger.			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> US Dollars	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Output	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Length of Project
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> NONE			
<b>DATA SOURCE:</b> WHO WILL COLLECT DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Program Participants.  HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected using a survey of targeted individuals of FFPr projects, review of lending reports of financial institutions with agricultural and rural loan programs, or a survey of financial institutions with agricultural and rural loans			
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> Count targeted individuals within the scope of the USDA project. Convert local currency to US dollars at the average market foreign exchange rate for the reporting period. This indicator measures the <i>value</i> of loans to farmers and others.			
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>			
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> Yes [4.5.2-29]	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> Yes	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> FtF frequency of reporting is annually	

<b>FTF 5:</b> Number of private enterprises, producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied new technologies or management practices as result of USDA assistance			
<b>DEFINITION:</b> This indicator measures the total number of private enterprises (processors, input dealers, storage and transport companies) producer associations, cooperatives, water users associations, fishing associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, water users associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs), that applied new techniques aimed at organization functions such as member services, processing, management(financial, planning, human resources), marketing, and accounting, procurement, technical innovations, quality control, information technology, etc., as a result of USG assistance in this reporting year.			
<b>RATIONALE:</b> Tracks private sector and civil society behavior change that is essential to increase agricultural sector productivity.			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Outcome	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Project Length
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> NONE			
<b>DATA SOURCE:</b> WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Program Participants  HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected via survey, observation, or project records of all targeted individuals			
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> Count all types of technology or management practices that were improved.  Count each type of organization one time. Adoption of a new technology or management practice by the enterprise, association, cooperative or CBO is counted as one and not as applied to the number of their employees and/or membership. For example, when a farmer association incorporates new corn storage innovations as part of member services, the application is counted as one association and not multiplied by the number of farmer-members.			
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>			
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> Yes [4.5.2-28]	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> Yes	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> FtF frequency of reporting is annually.	

<b>FTF 6: Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of USDA assistance</b>			
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> The number of public-private partnerships in agriculture or nutrition formed during the reporting year due to USDA intervention (i.e. agricultural or nutrition activity, as described below.) Private partnerships can be long or short in duration (length is not a criteria for measurement.) Partnerships with multiple partners should only be counted once. A public-private alliance (partnership) is considered formed when there is a clear agreement, usually written, to work together to achieve a common objective. There must be either a cash or in-kind significant contribution to the effort by both the public and private entity. A private entity can be a for-profit entity, an NGO using private funds, a private company, a community group, or a state-owned enterprise which seeks to make a profit (even if unsuccessfully). A public entity can be a donor-funded program participant, a national or sub-national government, or state-owned enterprises which are non-profit.</p> <p>A project may form more than one partnership with the same entity, but this is likely to be rare. In counting partnerships, we are not counting transactions with a partner entity; we are counting the number of partnerships formed during the reporting year. Public-private partnerships counted should be only those formed during the current reporting year. Any partnership that was formed in a previous year should not be included.</p> <p>An agricultural activity is any activity related to the supply of agricultural inputs, production methods, agricultural processing or transportation. A nutritional activity includes any activity focused on attempting to improve the nutritional content of agricultural products as provided to consumers, develop improved nutritional products, increase support for nutrition service delivery, etc.</p>			
<p><b>RATIONALE:</b> The assumption of this indicator is that if more partnerships are formed it is likely that there will be more investment in agriculture or nutrition-related activities, which ultimately contributes to agriculture sector growth. The improvement in growth will increase the incomes of all, but because the focus of project work is on the vulnerable (women, children and the poor) there will also be a reduction in poverty.</p>			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Output	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Project Length
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> NONE			
<p><b>DATA SOURCE:</b> WHO WILL COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Program Participants.</p> <p>HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected at the project-level, through project records of activities and capacity building carried out by the project, observation and analysis of the host government legal status of the various policies being addressed. Policies, legislation, regulations should be submitted to USDA and attached in project reports.</p>			
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> Only count partnerships that are attributable to USDA investment.			
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>			
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> Yes [4.5.2-12]	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> FtF frequency of reporting is annually.	

FTF 7: Number of jobs attributed to USDA assistance			
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Jobs are all types of employment opportunities created during the reporting year in agriculture- or rural-related enterprises (including paid on-farm/fishery employment.) Jobs lasting less than one month are not counted in order to emphasize those jobs that provide more stability through duration. Jobs should be converted to full-time equivalents. Thus, a job that lasts four months should be counted as 1/3 FTE. Do not consider the number of hours worked per day or per week as work hours may vary greatly.</p> <p>Attributed to USDA assistance includes farming and non-farm jobs where USDA investments were intentional in assisting in any way to expand (or contract) jobs and where a program objective of the USDA investment was job creation.</p>			
<p><b>RATIONALE:</b> This is a direct measure of improved livelihoods, as it measures creation of employment and related income. However, USDA is concerned about creation of sustainable employment, not temporary employment (of short duration such as a period of less than one month.)</p>			
INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number: jobs	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Outcome	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Project Length
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> NONE			
<p><b>DATA SOURCE:</b> WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Program Participants.</p> <p>HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected by project records, firm/farm records.</p>			
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> Collect data only at the project-level, attributed to FFPr programs.			
RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE			
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> Yes [4.5-2]	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> FtF frequency of reporting is annually.	

<b>FTF 8: Number of policies, regulations, and/or administrative procedures supporting improved industry standards prepared with USDA assistance passed/approved</b>			
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Number of agricultural enabling environment policies/regulations/administrative procedures in the areas of agricultural resource, food, market standards &amp; regulation, public investment, natural resource or water management and climate change adaptation/mitigation as it related to agriculture that:</p> <p>Stage 1: Underwent the first stage of the policy reform process i.e. analysis (review of existing policy/regulation/administrative procedure and/or proposal of new policy/regulations/administrative procedures.)</p> <p>Stage 2: Underwent the second stage of the policy reform process. The second stage includes public debate and/or consultation with stakeholders on the proposed new or revised policy/regulation/administrative procedure.</p> <p>Stage 3: Underwent the third stage of the policy reform process (policies were presented for legislation/degree to improve the policy environment for smallholder-based agriculture.)</p> <p>Stage 4: Underwent the fourth stage of the policy reform process [official approval (legislation/decree) of new or revised policy/regulation/administrative procedure by relevant authority.]</p> <p>Stage 5: Completed the policy reform process (implementation of new or revised policy/regulation/administrative procedure by relevant authority.)</p>			
<p><b>RATIONALE:</b> This indicator measures the number of policies/regulations/administrative procedures in the various stages of progress towards an enhanced enabling environment for agriculture whose sub-elements are specific policy sectors. It includes the development, implementation and enforcement of policies and regulations that support the achievement of one or more results in the FFPr framework focused on expanding trade in agricultural products. This indicator is easily aggregated upward.</p>			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number: policies, regulations, and/or administrative procedures and supplementary narrative	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Stages 1 & 2: Output Stages 3, 4 & 5: Outcome	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Although this set of five indicators tracks individual policies through the stages, one should see the aggregates of these indicators, over time, change in certain ways. One should expect the value of the indicators measuring the earlier stages to decline and the indicators measuring the later stages of progress to increase as the enabling environment is strengthened (i.e. move from analysis to adoption and implementation of reforms)	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Project Length
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> NONE			
<p><b>DATA SOURCE:</b></p> <p>WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Program Participants.</p> <p>HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected at the project-level, through project records of activities and capacity building carried out by the project, observation and analysis of the host government legal status of the various policies being addressed. Policies, legislation, regulations should</p>			

FY2014 Food Aid Proposal Guidance: Annex II

be submitted to USDA and attached in biannual project reports.		
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> Only count policies specifically addressed with USDA assistance.		
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>		
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> Yes [4.5.1-24]	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> None



<b>FTF 9: Kilometers of roads improved or constructed as a result of USDA assistance</b>			
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> A road opens up transport from rural spaces where rural-based production activities such as agriculture are taking place, and connects, either directly or indirectly, with population centers and market activity.</p> <p>A road “improvement” indicates that the intervention significantly improved the ease of commercial transport along that road, while “constructed” refers to a new road. Include the extent to which roads are built/improved to be climate resistant.</p> <p>In general, a road need not necessarily be paved with cement or asphalt but should significantly facilitate the transport of goods compared to the previous situation without the road or without the road improvement.</p>			
<p><b>RATIONALE:</b> The ability to move harvested goods to storage or processing facilities or to market has a direct impact on efficiency of post-production processes. As such, a project may aim to build or improve roads leading to and from agricultural producers (farms).</p>			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Kilometers	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Output	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Project Length
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> NONE			
<p><b>DATA SOURCE:</b></p> <p>WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Program Participants.</p> <p>HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected through direct measurement or geo-spatial imaging (GPS) measurement of the length of roads added or improved in the project, project records</p>			
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> Count only those roads constructed with USDA assistance.			
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>			
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> Yes [4.5.1-17]	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> FtF frequency of reporting is annually	

<b>FTF 10: Total increase in installed storage capacity (dry or cold storage) as a result of USDA assistance</b>			
<b>DEFINITION:</b> This indicator measures total increase in functioning (refurbished and new) cubic meters of storage capacity that have been installed through USDA programming and leverage during the reporting year. Installed storage capacity is an aggregate amount that encompasses on-farm and off-farm storage, dry goods and cold chain storage. Both newly installed and refurbished storage should be counted here.			
<b>RATIONALE:</b> Post harvest losses of foodstuffs and other agricultural products are typically a significant proportion of overall initial production in developing countries. A reduction in post-harvest losses through greater storage capacity could, therefore, substantially increase both food and income available to rural households and increase food availability to urban areas, as well.			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Total cubic meters	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Output	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Project Length
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> NONE			
<b>DATA SOURCE:</b> WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Program Participants.  HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected through a survey of farmers about new storage facilities, direct observation of storage units added to target agricultural producers (farms) (calculate total volume of additional storage capacity across all agricultural producers (farms)), project records			
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> Collect data on and off-farm, counting only direct beneficiaries.			
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>			
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> Yes [4.5-10]	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> FtF frequency of reporting is annually	

<b>FTF 11: Number of farmers and others who have applied new techniques or technologies as result of USDA assistance</b>			
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> This indicator measures the total number of agricultural producers, ranchers and other primary sector producers (food and non-food crops, livestock products, wild fisheries, aquaculture, and agro-forestry that applied new technologies anywhere within the food and fiber system as a result of USDA assistance.</p> <p>This includes innovations in efficiency, value-addition, on-farm post-harvest management, sustainable land management, forest, and water management. Technologies to be counted here are agriculture-related technologies and innovations. Relevant technologies include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mechanical and physical: New land preparation, irrigation, harvesting, and product handling technologies</li> <li>• Biological: new germ plasm (varieties, breeds, etc.) that could be higher-yielding or higher in nutritional content and/or more resilient to climate impacts; affordable food-based nutritional supplementation such as Vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, or high-protein maize, or improved livestock breeds; soil management practices that increase biotic activity and soil organic matter levels; and livestock health services and products such as vaccines;</li> <li>• Chemical Fertilizers; insecticides and pesticides safe storage application and disposal of agricultural chemicals, effluent and wastes, and soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiencies (e.g. soil organic matter);</li> <li>• Other practices, including cultural practices: conservation agriculture, improved/sustainable agricultural production and marketing practices, increased use of climate information for planning disaster risk strategies in place, climate change mitigation and energy efficiency, and natural resources management practices that increase productivity (e.g. upstream watershed conservation) and/or resilience to climate change including soil and water conservation and management practices (e.g. erosion control, water harvesting, low or no-till); sustainable fishing practices (e.g. ecological fishery reserves, improved fishing gear, establishment of fishery management plans); Integrated Pest Management (IPM), and Integrated Soil Fertility Management (ISFM) related to agriculture should all be included as improved techniques or technologies.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>RATIONALE:</b> Technological change and its adoption by different actors in the agricultural supply chain will be critical to increasing agricultural productivity. In addition, private sector and civil society behavior change leads to increased agricultural sector productivity.</p>			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Outcome	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Length of Project
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> NONE			
<p><b>DATA SOURCE:</b></p> <p>WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Program Participants.</p> <p>HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected via survey, observation, project or association records, or farm records of all targeted individuals</p>			
<p><b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> All significant improvements to existing techniques or technologies should be counted.</p>			
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>			
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> Yes [4.5.2-5]	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b>	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> FtF frequency of reporting is annually	

FY2014 Food Aid Proposal Guidance: Annex II

	Yes	<p>FtF 4.5.2-5 combines new techniques and management practices, whereas FFPr separates new techniques and technologies (this Indicator) from improved management practices (Indicator 5)</p> <p>FtF includes farmers and others, whereas FFPr includes only primary sector producers.</p> <p>FtF only counts the dominant technology, whereas FFPr allows multiple innovations per producer.</p>
--	-----	---

<b>FTF 12:</b> Number of farmers and others who have received training on improved farm management practices (i.e. governance, administration, or financial management) as a result of USDA assistance			
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> This indicator measures the total number of individuals to whom significant knowledge or skills have been imparted as a result of training. Type of individuals include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Farmers, ranchers, and other primary sector producers (food and non-food crops, livestock products, wild fisheries, aquaculture, agro-forestry, and natural resource-based products are included) who received training in application of new technologies, business management, linking to markets, etc.</li> <li>• Extension specialists, researchers, policymakers, and others who are engaged in the food, feed and fiber system and natural resources and water management.</li> <li>• Individual processors (not firms), rural entrepreneurs, managers and traders, natural resource managers, etc.</li> </ul> <p>Include training of on-farm, agriculture-related management practices related to governance, administration, and finance operations anywhere within the food and fiber system as a result of USDA assistance. Improved management practices include calculation of input, output, and labor needs; the use of business practices related to the management of land, livestock, equipment, facilities, transportation, and shipping; how to use information technology in farm management, including computers and GPS; financial planning, such as cash flow, balance sheet, income statements, variable and fixed agents; and how to maintain records, including financial and production documents, receipts and expenses, maintaining and using inventories, etc.</p> <p>Count as training interactions that are intentional, structured, and purposed for imparting knowledge or skills.</p>			
<b>RATIONALE:</b> Enhanced human capacity is key to transformational development, which is critical to increasing agricultural productivity.			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Output	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Project Length
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> NONE			
<p><b>DATA SOURCE:</b></p> <p>WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Program Participants.</p> <p>HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant training records, reports, or surveys. Program participants should keep detailed training lists for all training sessions</p>			
<p><b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> Count only individuals targeted by USDA programs.</p> <p>Significant improvements to existing farm management practices should be counted.</p> <p>This indicator is to count individuals receiving training on improved farm management practices.</p>			
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>			
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> None	

<b>FTF 13: Number of farmers and others using financial services as a result of USDA assistance</b>			
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Total number of farmers, fishers, pastoralists, ranchers, etc., cooperatives, MSME [micro (1-5), small (6-50), medium (51-100)*] business enterprises (processors, service providers, manufacturers) using services from financial enterprises as a result of USDA assistance. Clients may be involved in agro-processing, community forestry, fisheries, input suppliers, or other small businesses receiving USDA assistance. Examples of financial services include those services that help identify and access funds through formal and alternative channels that include supplier or buyer credits, factoring companies, equity financing, venture capital, credit unions, banks, and the like; assist buyers in establishing links with commercial banks (letters of credit, etc.) to help them finance production directly. USDA assistance may include partial loan guarantee programs or any support facilitating the receipt of a loan or other equity (e.g. an in-kind loan such as a tractor, plow or other equipment given as a loan.) Loans could be given by informal lenders and in-kind lenders of equipment or other inputs (e.g. fertilizer, seeds) transport or food with repayment being in cash or in-kind.</p> <p>*parenthesis = number of employees</p>			
<p><b>RATIONALE:</b> Increased access to financial services will help expand markets and trade, which will, in turn, expand agricultural productivity, which will help achieve the key objective of inclusive agriculture sector growth.</p>			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Output	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Project Length
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> NONE			
<p><b>DATA SOURCE:</b></p> <p>WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Program Participants.</p> <p>HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected through a survey of targeted individuals of FFPr projects , review of bank/financial institution or USDA records, or survey of financial institutions</p>			
<p><b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> The indicator does not measure the value of the assistance, but the number of farmers and others who received financial services as a result of USDA assistance. Only count the farmer or other once per reporting year, even if multiple, financial services are accessed.</p>			
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>			
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> YES	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> None	

<b>FTF 14:</b> Number of farmers and others who have received training on improved agricultural techniques and technologies as a result of USDA assistance			
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> The number of individuals to whom significant knowledge or skills have been imparted through interactions that are intentional, structured, and purposed for imparting knowledge or skills as a result of USDA assistance should be counted as training.</p> <p>This includes farmers, ranchers, fishers, and other primary sector producers who receive training in a variety of best practices in productivity, on-farm post-harvest management, linking to markets, etc. Include training on climate risk analysis, adaptation, mitigation, and vulnerability assessments, as it relates to agriculture. Delivery mechanisms can include a variety of extension methods as well as technical assistance activities.</p> <p>This includes innovations in efficiency, value-addition, post-harvest management, sustainable land management, forest, and water management. Technologies to be counted here are agriculture-related technologies and innovations. Relevant technologies include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mechanical and physical: New land preparation, irrigation, harvesting, and product handling technologies</li> <li>• Biological: new germ plasm (varieties, breeds, etc.) that could be higher-yielding or higher in nutritional content and/or more resilient to climate impacts; affordable food-based nutritional supplementation such as Vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, or high-protein maize, or improved livestock breeds; soil management practices that increase biotic activity and soil organic matter levels; and livestock health services and products such as vaccines;</li> <li>• Chemical Fertilizers; insecticides and pesticides safe storage application and disposal of agricultural chemicals, effluent and wastes, and soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiencies (e.g. soil organic matter);</li> <li>• Other practices, including cultural practices: conservation agriculture, improved/sustainable agricultural production and marketing practices, increased use of climate information for planning disaster risk strategies in place, climate change mitigation and energy efficiency, and natural resources management practices that increase productivity (e.g. upstream watershed conservation or bio-diesel fueled farm equipment ) and/or resilience to climate change including soil and water conservation and management practices (e.g. erosion control, water harvesting, low or no-till); sustainable fishing practices (e.g. ecological fishery reserves, improved fishing gear, establishment of fishery management plans); Integrated Pest Management (IPM), and Integrated Soil Fertility Management (ISFM) related to agriculture should all be included as improved techniques or technologies.</li> </ul>			
<p><b>RATIONALE:</b> Measures enhanced human capacity for increased agriculture productivity through improved agricultural techniques and technologies, which are key to transformational development.</p>			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Output	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Project Length
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> NONE.			
<p><b>DATA SOURCE:</b></p> <p>WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Program Participants.</p> <p>HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant training records and reports. Program participants should keep detailed training lists for all training sessions.</p>			
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> While each individual will only count one time, count all significant techniques			

or technologies that have been applied in the disaggregation.

This Indicator is to count individuals *receiving* training on improved production techniques or technologies.

Training to extension specialists, researchers, policymakers and others who are engaged in the food, feed and fiber system and natural resources and water management in both in-country and off-shore training are included in Indicator 5, "Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training."

**RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE**

<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> YES	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> None
------------------------------	---	--



## FOOD FOR PROGRESS STANDARD INDICATORS

Result #	Result (from framework)	Indicator Type	Indicator <sup>1</sup>	Feed the Future?	Unit
FFPr 1.2	Increased Use of Improved Agricultural Techniques and Technologies	outcome	Number of (direct beneficiaries) who have applied new techniques or technologies as result of USDA assistance	Y	Number
FFPr 1.3	Improved Farm Management	output	Number of (direct beneficiaries) who have received training on improved farm management practices (i.e. governance, administration, or financial management) as a result of USDA assistance	Y	Number
FFPr 1.3	Improved Farm Management	outcome	Number of (direct beneficiaries) who have applied improved farm management practices (i.e. governance, administration, or financial management)	Y	Number
FFPr 1.2.3 /2.2.3.1 /2.3.1.2	Increased Use of Financial Services	output	Number of (direct beneficiaries) benefiting from using financial services as a result of USDA assistance	Y	Number
FFPr 1.2.3 /2.2.3.1 /2.3.1.2	Increased Use of Financial Services	output	Number of (loans, grants, etc) disbursed to (direct beneficiaries) as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number
FFPr 1.2.3 /2.2.3.1 /2.3.1.2	Increased Use of Financial Services	output	Value of (loans, grants, etc) provided (direct beneficiaries) as a result of USDA assistance	Y	US Dollars
FFPr 1.2.4	Increased Knowledge by Farmers of Improved Agricultural Techniques and Technologies	output	Number of (direct beneficiaries) who have received training on improved agricultural techniques and technologies as a result of USDA assistance	Y	Number
FFPr 2.4.2	Improved Policy & Regulatory Framework	output and outcome	Number of policies, regulations and/or administrative procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USDA assistance	Y	Number
FFPr SO1 and SO2	Increased Agricultural Productivity/Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products	output	Number of individuals benefiting directly from USDA-funded interventions	N	Number

FY2014 Food Aid Proposal Guidance: Annex II

Result #	Result (from framework)	Indicator Type	Indicator <sup>1</sup>	Feed the Future?	Unit
FFPr SO1 and SO2	Increased Agricultural Productivity/Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products	output	Number of individuals benefiting indirectly from USDA- funded interventions	N	Number

<sup>1</sup>Definitions of the Indicators are provided in the Food for Progress Standard Indicator Definitions section below

# FOOD FOR PROGRESS STANDARD INDICATOR

## DEFINITIONS

<b>FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1:</b> Increased Agricultural Productivity		<b>FFPr 1.2:</b> Increased Use of Improved Agricultural Techniques and Technologies	
		<b>Note:</b> Use this indicator to measure result 1.2	
<b>FFPr INDICATOR 1:</b> Number of (direct beneficiaries) who have applied new techniques or technologies as result of USDA assistance			
<b>DEFINITION:</b> This indicator measures the total number of agricultural producers, ranchers and other primary sector producers (food and non-food crops, livestock products, wild fisheries, aquaculture, and agro-forestry that applied new technologies anywhere within the food and fiber system as a result of USDA assistance.			
This includes innovations in efficiency, value-addition, on-farm post-harvest management, sustainable land management, forest, and water management. Technologies to be counted here are agriculture-related technologies and innovations. Relevant technologies include:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Mechanical and physical: New land preparation, irrigation, harvesting, and product handling technologies</li><li>• Biological: new germ plasm (varieties, breeds, etc.) that could be higher-yielding or higher in nutritional content and/or more resilient to climate impacts; affordable food-based nutritional supplementation such as Vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, or high-protein maize, or improved livestock breeds; soil management practices that increase biotic activity and soil organic matter levels; and livestock health services and products such as vaccines;</li><li>• Chemical Fertilizers; insecticides and pesticides safe storage application and disposal of agricultural chemicals, effluent and wastes, and soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiencies (e.g. soil organic matter);</li><li>• Other practices, including cultural practices: conservation agriculture, improved/sustainable agricultural production and marketing practices, increased use of climate information for planning disaster risk strategies in place, climate change mitigation and energy efficiency, and natural resources management practices that increase productivity (e.g. upstream watershed conservation) and/or resilience to climate change including soil and water conservation and management practices (e.g. erosion control, water harvesting, low or no-till); sustainable fishing practices (e.g. ecological fishery reserves, improved fishing gear, establishment of fishery management plans); Integrated Pest Management (IPM), and Integrated Soil Fertility Management (ISFM) related to agriculture should all be included as improved techniques or technologies.</li></ul>			
<b>RATIONALE:</b> Technological change and its adoption by different actors in the agricultural supply chain will be critical to increasing agricultural productivity. In addition, private sector and civil society behavior change leads to increased agricultural sector productivity.			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Outcome	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Length of Project

<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> Please disaggregate by inserting into the parenthesis area within the indicator the following beneficiary types connected to this activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Producers (farmers, fishers, pastoralists, ranchers, etc.)</li> <li>• People in government (e.g. policy makers, extension workers)</li> <li>• People in firms (e.g. processors, service providers, manufacturers)</li> </ul> Please create a separate indicator for all desegregations.		
<b>DATA SOURCE:</b> WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Program Participants.  HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected via survey, observation, project or association records, or farm records of all targeted individuals		
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> All significant improvements to existing techniques or technologies should be counted.		
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>		
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> Yes [4.5.2-5]	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> Yes	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> FtF frequency of reporting is annually FtF 4.5.2-5 combines new techniques and management practices, whereas FFPr separates new techniques and technologies (this Indicator) from improved management practices (Indicator 5) FtF includes farmers and others, whereas FFPr includes only primary sector producers. FtF only counts the dominant technology, whereas FFPr allows multiple innovations per producer.

<b>FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1:</b> Increased Agricultural Productivity		<b>FFPr 1.3/2.2.1/2.3.2:</b> Improved Farm Management/Improved Marketing of Agricultural Products/Improved Management Practices of Buyer/Seller Groups Within Trade Sector	
<b>FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:</b> Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products		<b>Note:</b> Use this indicator to measure activity(ies) that support result 1.3/2.2.1/2.3.2. To measure the result 1.3/2.2.1/2.3.2, you must suggest a custom indicator that measures improved management/marketing/practices.	
<b>FFPr INDICATOR 2:</b> Number of (direct beneficiaries) who have received training on improved farm management practices (i.e. governance, administration, or financial management) as a result of USDA assistance			
<b>DEFINITION:</b> This indicator measures the total number of individuals to whom significant knowledge or skills have been imparted as a result of training. Type of individuals include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Farmers, ranchers, and other primary sector producers (food and non-food crops, livestock products, wild fisheries, aquaculture, agro-forestry, and natural resource-based products are included) who received training in application of new technologies, business management, linking to markets, etc.</li><li>Extension specialists, researchers, policymakers, and others who are engaged in the food, feed and fiber system and natural resources and water management.</li><li>Individual processors (not firms), rural entrepreneurs, managers and traders, natural resource managers, etc.</li></ul>			
Include training of on-farm, agriculture-related management practices related to governance, administration, and finance operations anywhere within the food and fiber system as a result of USDA assistance. Improved management practices include calculation of input, output, and labor needs; the use of business practices related to the management of land, livestock, equipment, facilities, transportation, and shipping; how to use information technology in farm management, including computers and GPS; financial planning, such as cash flow, balance sheet, income statements, variable and fixed agents; and how to maintain records, including financial and production documents, receipts and expenses, maintaining and using inventories, etc.			
Count as training interactions that are intentional, structured, and purposed for imparting knowledge or skills.			
<b>RATIONALE:</b> Enhanced human capacity is key to transformational development, which is critical to increasing agricultural productivity.			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Output	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Biannually covering the periods: October 1-March 31 and April 1-September 30
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> Please disaggregate by inserting into parenthesis area within the indicator the following beneficiary types connected to the activity of training. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Producers (farmers, fishers, pastoralists, ranchers, etc.)</li><li>People in government (e.g. policy makers, extension workers)</li><li>People in firms (e.g. processors, service providers, manufacturers)</li></ul> Please create a separate indicator for all desegregations.			

<b>DATA SOURCE:</b> WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Program Participants.  HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant training records, reports, or surveys. Program participants should keep detailed training lists for all training sessions		
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> Count only individuals targeted by USDA programs. Significant improvements to existing farm management practices should be counted. This indicator is to count individuals receiving training on improved farm management practices, for which the outcome, i.e. individuals applying new farm management practices, should be reported under FFPr Indicator 4.		
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>		
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> None

FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Increased Agricultural Productivity		FFPr 1.3: Improved Farm Management	
		Note: Use this indicator to measure result 1.3	
FFPr INDICATOR 3: Number of (direct beneficiaries) who have applied improved farm management practices (i.e. governance, administration, or financial management)			
DEFINITION: This indicator measures the total number of beneficiaries who are applying the knowledge or skills received in USDA supported training. This includes:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Farmers, ranchers, and other primary sector producers (food and non-food crops, livestock products, wild fisheries, aquaculture, agro-forestry, and natural resource-based products are included) who received training in application of new technologies, business management, linking to markets, etc.</li><li>Extension specialists, researchers, policymakers, and others who are engaged in the food, feed and fiber system and natural resources and water management.</li><li>Individual processors (not firms), rural entrepreneurs, managers and traders, natural resource managers, etc.</li></ul>			
Include on-farm, agriculture-related management practices related to governance, administration, and finance operations anywhere within the food and fiber system as a result of USDA assistance. Improved management practices include calculating input, output, and labor needs; incorporated business practices related to the management of land, livestock, equipment, facilities, transportation, and shipping; the use of information technology, including computers and GPS; financial planning, cash flow, balance sheet, income statements, variable and fixed agents; and record keeping, including financial and production documents, receipts and expenses, maintaining and using inventories, etc.			
RATIONALE: Behavior change by different actors in agriculture results in increased agricultural productivity.			
INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number	INDICATOR LEVEL: Outcome	DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better	FREQUENCY OF REPORTING: Length of Project
DISAGGREGATION:			
Please disaggregate by inserting into parenthesis area within the indicator the following beneficiary types connected to the activity of training:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Producers (farmers, fishers, pastoralists, ranchers, etc.)</li><li>People in firms (e.g. processors, service providers, manufacturers)</li><li>People in government (e.g. extension workers, policymakers)</li></ul>			
Please create a separate indicator for all desegregations.			
DATA SOURCE:			
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Program participants.			
HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected through direct on-farm observation of practices in use, or survey of all targeted individuals			
MEASUREMENT NOTES: Count only those individuals targeted by USDA programs. This indicator is to count individuals who applied training for which the outcome, i.e. individuals receiving USDA training new farm management practices, should be reported under Indicator 5.			
RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE			
FtF INDICATOR: No	FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR: No	DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES: None	

<b>FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1:</b> Increased Agricultural Productivity		<b>FFPr 1.2.3/2.2.3.1/2.3.1.2:</b> Increased Use of Financial Services	
<b>FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:</b> Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products		<b>Note:</b> Use this indicator to measure result 1.2.3/2.2.3.1/2.3.1.2	
<b>FFPr INDICATOR 4:</b> Number of (direct beneficiaries) benefiting from using financial services as a result of USDA assistance			
<b>DEFINITION:</b> Total number of farmers, fishers, pastoralists, ranchers, etc., cooperatives, MSME [micro (1-5), small (6-50), medium (51-100)*] business enterprises (processors, service providers, manufacturers) using services from financial enterprises as a result of USDA assistance. Clients may be involved in agro-processing, community forestry, fisheries, input suppliers, or other small businesses receiving USDA assistance. Examples of financial services include those services that help identify and access funds through formal and alternative channels that include supplier or buyer credits, factoring companies, equity financing, venture capital, credit unions, banks, and the like; assist buyers in establishing links with commercial banks (letters of credit, etc.) to help them finance production directly. USDA assistance may include partial loan guarantee programs or any support facilitating the receipt of a loan or other equity (e.g. an in-kind loan such as a tractor, plow or other equipment given as a loan.) Loans could be given by informal lenders and in-kind lenders of equipment or other inputs (e.g. fertilizer, seeds) transport or food with repayment being in cash or in-kind. *parenthesis = number of employees			
<b>RATIONALE:</b> Increased access to financial services will help expand markets and trade, which will, in turn, expand agricultural productivity, which will help achieve the key objective of inclusive agriculture sector growth.			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Output	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Biannually covering the periods: October 1-March 31 and April 1-September 30
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> Please disaggregate by inserting into the parenthesis area within the indicator the following beneficiary types connected to this activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Producers</li><li>• Cooperative members</li><li>• People in firms (e.g. processors, service providers, manufacturers)</li></ul> Please create a separate indicator for all desegregations.			
<b>DATA SOURCE:</b> WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Program Participants.  HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected through a survey of targeted individuals of FFPr projects , review of bank/financial institution or USDA records, or survey of financial institutions			
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> The indicator does not measure the value of the assistance but the number of producers and others who received financial services as a result of USDA assistance. Only count the producer or other once per reporting year, even if multiple, financial services are accessed.  This indicator is to count individuals who received financial services, whereas Indicator 7 measures the number of loans disbursed to farmers and others, and Indicator 8 measures the value of the loans			



disbursed to farmers and others.		
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>		
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> None

<b>FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1:</b> Increased Agricultural Productivity		<b>FFPr 1.2.3/2.2.3.1/2.3.1.2:</b> Increased Use of Financial Services	
<b>FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:</b> Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products		<b>Note:</b> Use this indicator to measure activity(ies) that support result 1.2.3/2.2.3.1/2.3.1.2. To measure the result 1.2.3/2.2.3.1/2.3.1.2, you must suggest a custom indicator that measures increased use.	
<b>FFPr INDICATOR 5:</b> Number of (loans, grants, etc) disbursed to (direct beneficiaries) as a result of USDA assistance			
<b>DEFINITION:</b> This indicator adds the number of loans made (i.e. disbursed during the reporting year as a result of USDA assistance) to producers (farmers, fishers, etc.) input suppliers, transporters, processors, as well as loans to Micro (1-5), Small (6-50), and Medium (51-100) Enterprises (MSMEs) in rural areas that are in a targeted agricultural value chain as a result of USG assistance. The indicator counts loans disbursed to the recipient, not loans in process, but not yet available to the recipient. The loans can be made by any size financial institution from micro-credit through national commercial bank, and includes any type of micro-finance institution, such as an NGO.			
<b>RATIONALE:</b> Making more financial loans shows that there is improved access to business development and financial services. This, in turn, will help expand markets and trade and should also contribute to IR1’s expanding agricultural productivity which will help achieve the key objective of inclusive agriculture sector being defined broader than just crop production. In turn, this contributes to both goals of reducing poverty and hunger.			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Output	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Biannually covering the periods: October 1-March 31 and April 1-September 30
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> Please disaggregate by inserting into the parenthesis area within the indicator the following beneficiary types connected to this activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Producers</li><li>• Cooperative members</li><li>• People in firms (e.g. processors, service providers, manufacturers)</li></ul> Please disaggregate by inserting into parenthesis area within the indicator the following beneficiary types connected to this activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Loans</li><li>• Grants</li><li>• Other financial products</li></ul> Please create a separate indicator for all desegregations.			
<b>DATA SOURCE:</b> WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Program Participants.  HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected through a survey of targeted individuals of FFPr projects, a review of banking/lending institution records or a survey of survey of financial institutions			
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> NONE			
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>			
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> None	

<b>FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1:</b> Increased Agricultural Productivity		<b>FFPr 1.2.3/2.2.3.1/2.3.1.2:</b> Increased Use of Financial Services	
<b>FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:</b> Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products		<b>Note:</b> Use this indicator to measure result 1.2.3/2.2.3.1/2.3.1.2	
<b>FFPr INDICATOR 6:</b> Value of (loans, grants, etc) provided (direct beneficiaries) as a result of USDA assistance			
<b>DEFINITION:</b> This indicator adds the value of loans made (i.e. disbursed during the reporting year as a result of USDA assistance) to producers (farmers, fishers, etc.) input suppliers, transporters, processors, as well as loans to Micro (1-5), Small (6-50), and Medium (51-100) Enterprises (MSMEs) in rural areas that are in a targeted agricultural value chain as a result of USDA assistance. The indicator counts loans disbursed to the recipient, not loans merely made (e.g. in process, but not yet available to the recipient.) The loans can be made by any size financial institution from micro-credit through national commercial bank, and includes any type of micro-finance institution, such as an NGO.			
<b>RATIONALE:</b> Making more financial loans shows that there is improved access to business development and financial services. This, in turn, will help expand markets and trade and ought to also contribute to IR1’s expanding agricultural productivity which will help achieve the key objective of inclusive agriculture sector being defined broader than just crop production. In turn, this contributes to both goals of reducing poverty and hunger.			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> US Dollars	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Output	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Biannually covering the periods: October 1-March 31 and April 1-September 30
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> Please disaggregate by inserting into parenthesis area within the indicator the following beneficiary types connected to this activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Producers</li><li>• Cooperative members</li><li>• People in firms (e.g. processors, service providers, manufacturers)</li></ul> Please disaggregate by inserting into parenthesis area within the indicator the following beneficiary types connected to this activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Loans</li><li>• Grants</li><li>• Other financial products</li></ul> Please create a separate indicator for all desegregations.			
<b>DATA SOURCE:</b> WHO WILL COLLECT DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Program Participants.  HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected using a survey of targeted individuals of FFPr projects, review of lending reports of financial institutions with agricultural and rural loan programs, or a survey of financial institutions with agricultural and rural loans			
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> Count targeted individuals within the scope of the USDA project. Convert local currency to US dollars at the average market foreign exchange rate for the reporting period.			

This indicator measures the <i>value</i> of loans to farmers and others, whereas FFPr Indicator 9 measures the total <i>number</i> of loans.		
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>		
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> Yes [4.5.2-29]	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> Yes	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> FtF frequency of reporting is annually

FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Increased Agricultural Productivity	FFPr 1.2.4: Increased Knowledge by Farmers of Improved Agricultural Techniques and Technologies		
	Note: Use this indicator to measure activity(ies) that support result 1.2.4. To measure the result 1.2.4, you must suggest a custom indicator that measures increased knowledge.		
FFPr INDICATOR 7: Number of (direct beneficiaries) who have received training on improved agricultural techniques and technologies as a result of USDA assistance			
DEFINITION: The number of individuals to whom significant knowledge or skills have been imparted through interactions that are intentional, structured, and purposed for imparting knowledge or skills as a result of USDA assistance should be counted as training.			
This includes farmers, ranchers, fishers, and other primary sector producers who receive training in a variety of best practices in productivity, on-farm post-harvest management, linking to markets, etc. Include training on climate risk analysis, adaptation, mitigation, and vulnerability assessments, as it relates to agriculture. Delivery mechanisms can include a variety of extension methods as well as technical assistance activities.			
This includes innovations in efficiency, value-addition, post-harvest management, sustainable land management, forest, and water management. Technologies to be counted here are agriculture-related technologies and innovations. Relevant technologies include:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Mechanical and physical: New land preparation, irrigation, harvesting, and product handling technologies</li><li>• Biological: new germ plasm (varieties, breeds, etc.) that could be higher-yielding or higher in nutritional content and/or more resilient to climate impacts; affordable food-based nutritional supplementation such as Vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, or high-protein maize, or improved livestock breeds; soil management practices that increase biotic activity and soil organic matter levels; and livestock health services and products such as vaccines;</li><li>• Chemical Fertilizers; insecticides and pesticides safe storage application and disposal of agricultural chemicals, effluent and wastes, and soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiencies (e.g. soil organic matter);</li><li>• Other practices, including cultural practices: conservation agriculture, improved/sustainable agricultural production and marketing practices, increased use of climate information for planning disaster risk strategies in place, climate change mitigation and energy efficiency, and natural resources management practices that increase productivity (e.g. upstream watershed conservation or bio-diesel fueled farm equipment ) and/or resilience to climate change including soil and water conservation and management practices (e.g. erosion control, water harvesting, low or no-till); sustainable fishing practices (e.g. ecological fishery reserves, improved fishing gear, establishment of fishery management plans); Integrated Pest Management (IPM), and Integrated Soil Fertility Management (ISFM) related to agriculture should all be included as improved techniques or technologies.</li></ul>			
RATIONALE: Measures enhanced human capacity for increased agriculture productivity through improved agricultural techniques and technologies, which are key to transformational development.			
INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number	INDICATOR LEVEL: Output	DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better	FREQUENCY OF REPORTING: Biannually covering the

			periods: October 1-March 31 and April 1-September 30
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> Please disaggregate by inserting into the parenthesis area within the indicator the following beneficiary types connected to this activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Producers (e.g. farmers, fishers, pastoralists, ranchers, etc.)</li> <li>• People in government (e.g. policy makers, extension workers)</li> <li>• People in firms (e.g. processors, service providers, manufacturers)</li> </ul> Please create a separate indicator for all desegregations.			
<b>DATA SOURCE:</b> WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by Program Participants.  HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant training records and reports. Program participants should keep detailed training lists for all training sessions.			
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> While each individual will only count one time, count all significant techniques or technologies that have been applied in the disaggregation.  This Indicator is to count individuals <i>receiving</i> training on improved production techniques or technologies, for which the outcome, i.e. individuals <i>applying</i> new production techniques or technologies, should be reported under FFPr Indicator 2.  Training to extension specialists, researchers, policymakers and others who are engaged in the food, feed and fiber system and natural resources and water management in both in-country and off-shore training are included in Indicator 5, "Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training."			
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>			
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> None	

<b>FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:</b> Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products		<b>FFPr 2.1.1.1:</b> Increased Adoption of Established Standards by Industry	
		<b>Note:</b> Use this indicator to measure result 2.1.1.1	
<b>FFPr INDICATOR 8:</b> Number of (policies, regulations and/or administrative procedures) in each of the following stages (insert specific stage) of development as a result of USDA assistance			
<b>DEFINITION:</b> Number of agricultural enabling environment policies/regulations/administrative procedures in the areas of agricultural resource, food, market standards & regulation, public investment, natural resource or water management and climate change adaptation/mitigation as it related to agriculture that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <u>Stage 1:</u> Underwent the first stage of the policy reform process i.e. analysis (review of existing policy/regulation/administrative procedure and/or proposal of new policy/regulations/administrative procedures.)</li><li>• <u>Stage 2:</u> Underwent the second stage of the policy reform process. The second stage includes public debate and/or consultation with stakeholders on the proposed new or revised policy/regulation/administrative procedure.</li><li>• <u>Stage 3:</u> Underwent the third stage of the policy reform process (policies were presented for legislation/degree to improve the policy environment for smallholder-based agriculture.)</li><li>• <u>Stage 4:</u> Underwent the fourth stage of the policy reform process [official approval (legislation/decree) of new or revised policy/regulation/administrative procedure by relevant authority.]</li><li>• <u>Stage 5:</u> Completed the policy reform process (implementation of new or revised policy/regulation/administrative procedure by relevant authority.)</li></ul>			
<b>RATIONALE:</b> This indicator measures the number of policies/regulations/administrative procedures in the various stages of progress towards an enhanced enabling environment for agriculture whose sub-elements are specific policy sectors. It includes the development, implementation and enforcement of policies and regulations that support the achievement of one or more results in the FFPr framework focused on expanding trade in agricultural products. This indicator is easily aggregated upward.			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number: policies, regulations, and/or administrative procedures and supplementary narrative	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Stages 1 & 2: Output Stages 3, 4 & 5: Outcome	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Although this set of five indicators tracks individual policies through the stages, one should see the aggregates of these indicators, over time, change in certain ways. One should expect the value of the indicators measuring the earlier stages to decline and the indicators measuring the later stages of progress to increase as the enabling environment is strengthened (i.e. move from analysis to adoption and implementation of reforms)	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Annually covering the period: October 1-September 30
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> Please indicate the specific item or stage into the indicator itself. Please create a separate indicator for all desaggregations.			
<b>DATA SOURCE:</b> <b>WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR:</b> Data will be collected by Program Participants.			

<p><b>HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED:</b> Data will be collected at the project-level, through project records of activities and capacity building carried out by the project, observation and analysis of the host government legal status of the various policies being addressed. Policies, legislation, regulations should be submitted to USDA and attached in biannual project reports.</p>		
<p><b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> Only count policies specifically addressed with USDA assistance.</p> <p>This indicator tracks the policy, regulation, or administrative procedure. Multiple project participants working in the same country or region (with regard to regional policies) may report the same policy, regulation, or administrative procedure as long as the program participant participated in the process and provided assistance to the development, drafting, formation of the law or policy.</p>		
<p align="center"><b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b></p>		
<p><b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> Yes [4.5.1-24]</p>	<p><b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No</p>	<p><b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> None</p>



FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Increased Agricultural Productivity		NOTE: This indicator must be used in all agreements. It can be included under either strategic objective.	
FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2: Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products (Domestic, Regional, and International)			
FFPr INDICATOR 9: Number of individuals benefiting directly from USDA-funded interventions			
<b>DEFINITION:</b> This is an output indicator measuring the number of individuals directly participating in USDA-funded interventions. The individuals must be engaged with a project activity or come into direct contact with a set of interventions (goods or services) provided by the project. This may include, for example, farmers and others receiving training, inputs, or financial services.			
Individuals merely contacted or involved in an activity through brief attendance (non-recurring participation) does not count under this indicator.			
This indicator only tracks direct beneficiaries reached with direct USDA assistance (funded in part or in whole by USDA). Individuals should not be double counted. Individuals may receive multiple interventions but should only be counted upon first receipt of project interventions.			
<b>RATIONALE:</b> Tracks access to services that can lead to adoption of improved agricultural techniques, technologies, practices, services, and policies that will result in greater agricultural productivity and expanded agricultural markets.			
INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number: individuals	INDICATOR LEVEL: Output	DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better	FREQUENCY OF REPORTING: Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30
DISAGGREGATION: NONE			
<b>DATA SOURCE:</b>			
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INICATOR: Data will be collected by program participants.			
HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant beneficiary tracking records and reports.			
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> This indicator provides a unique count of total project beneficiaries. It is linked to other FFPr indicators such as FFPr indicators 3 and 5 related to training on improved farm management and training on short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security and FFPr indicator 6 on farmers and others receiving financial services.			
Only direct beneficiaries should be counted. Indirect beneficiaries should not be counted under this indicator. Individual beneficiaries should come into direct contact or receipt of an intervention or set of interventions (i.e. farmers who receive training, inputs, financial services). Estimates of individuals benefiting from new road construction for example would not count and would be considered as <i>indirect</i> beneficiaries.			
For disaggregation, choose the most significant intervention received.			
RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE			
FtF INDICATOR: No	FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR: No	DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES: None	

<b>FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1:</b> Increased Agricultural Productivity		<b>NOTE:</b> This indicator must be used in all agreements. It can be included under either strategic objective.	
<b>FFPr RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:</b> Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products (Domestic, Regional, and International)			
<b>FFPr INDICATOR 10:</b> Total number of individuals benefiting indirectly from USDA-funded interventions			
<b>DEFINITION:</b> This is an output indicator measuring the number of individuals indirectly participating in USDA-funded interventions.			
Individuals should not be double counted. Individuals may receive multiple interventions but should only be counted upon first receipt of project interventions.			
<b>RATIONALE:</b> Tracks access to services and overall project direct beneficiaries.			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number: individuals	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Output	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> NONE			
<b>DATA SOURCE:</b> WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INICATOR: Data will be collected by program participants. HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant beneficiary tracking records and reports.			
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b>  Indirect beneficiaries are affected through a follow-on project or indirect effect but where there is plausible attribution—such as countries taking a USG-funded pilot intervention to scale, with no additional USDA funding; or donor and country harmonization around a common technical approach, in which USDA has been instrumental.  For disaggregation, choose the most significant intervention received.			
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>			
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> None	

# FOOD FOR PROGRESS ILLUSTRATIVE INDICATORS

FFPr Framework #1: Illustrative Indicators
<b>FFPr SO 1: Increased Agricultural Productivity</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Volume of selected crops produced / harvested per hectare (yield)</li> <li>2) Volume of selected animal products per animal (e.g., # of filters per cow per week)</li> <li>3) Value of production per hectare</li> </ol>
<b>FFPr 1.1: Improved Quality of Land and Water Resources</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number or percent of hectares in target area that meet threshold standards for soil quality (standards TBD)</li> <li>2) Number or percent of hectares in target area that meet threshold standards for moisture content of soil (standards TBD)</li> <li>3) Number or percent of hectares in target area that meet threshold standards for soil contamination (standards TBD)</li> <li>4) Number or percent of hectares in target area that meet threshold standards for water quality (standards TBD)</li> <li>5) Number or percent of hectares in target area that meet threshold standards for groundwater contamination (standards TBD)</li> </ol>
<b>FFPr 1.2: Increased Use of Improved Agricultural Techniques and Technologies</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number or percent of hectares being managed under improved techniques or technologies</li> <li>2) Number or percent of agricultural producers (agricultural producers (farms)) using improved agricultural techniques and technologies</li> <li>3) Number or percent of agricultural producers (agricultural producers (farms)) in target area using improved on-farm storage</li> <li>4) Percent of livestock in a target area that have been vaccinated (could be disaggregated by type of livestock)</li> <li>5) Number or percent of hectares being managed under sustainable agricultural practices</li> <li>6) Number or percent of agricultural producers (agricultural producers (farms)) using sustainable agricultural practices</li> </ol>
<b>FFPr 1.3: Improved Farm Management</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number or percent of agricultural producers who are actively implementing a business plan</li> <li>2) Number or percent of agricultural producers making decisions based on economic considerations or analysis</li> </ol>
<b>FFPr 1.2.1: Increased Availability of Improved Inputs</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number or percent of agricultural input suppliers in the target region that supply/sell improved inputs (e.g., high yield seeds, fertilizer, etc.)</li> <li>2) Number or percent of agricultural producers in target area within X miles (or X travel time) of suppliers that supply/sell improved inputs</li> <li>3) Number of specific improved inputs available to agricultural producers in target region (e.g., different types of HY seeds)</li> </ol>

FFPr Framework #1: Illustrative Indicators
<p><b>FFPr 1.2.2: Improved Infrastructure to Support On-farm Production</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number or percent of agricultural producers (agricultural producers (farms)) in target region that have two or more “quality/effective” (modern) on-farm structures</li> <li>2) Number or percent of agricultural producers (farms) in target region that have a “quality/effective” (modern) grain storage structure on farm</li> <li>3) Number or percent of agricultural producers (farms) in target region that have access to quality/effective off-farm storage for their product</li> <li>4) Number or percent of agricultural producers (farms) in target region who have access to sufficient water inputs through off-farm sources (irrigation feeder canals, etc.)</li> <li>5) Number or percent of hectares cultivated in target region with access to off-farm water supplies allowing for sufficient on-farm irrigation</li> </ol>
<p><b>FFPr 1.2.3: Increased Use of Financial Services</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number or percent of agricultural producers in target region who are accessing credit through any type of “formal” financial product (e.g., loans)</li> <li>2) Total value of credit accessed by agricultural producers in target region (e.g., value of loans issued)</li> <li>3) Per capita value of credit accessed by agricultural producers in target region</li> <li>4) Total number of loans issued (volume) to agricultural producers in target region</li> </ol>
<p><b>FFPr 1.2.4: Increased Knowledge by Farmers of Improved Agricultural Techniques and Technologies</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Percentage of agricultural producers in the region who can explain the key uses and benefits of the new crop rotation technique</li> <li>2) Percentage of agricultural producers who can demonstrate a threshold level of proficiency in a new harvesting technique</li> <li>3) Number of agricultural producers who receive a passing score on a post-extension workshop test given by extension agents</li> </ol>
<p><b>FFPr 1.3.1: Improved Knowledge Regarding Farm Management</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number or percent of agricultural producers demonstrating financial literacy</li> <li>2) Percent of agricultural producers in target region/area who can identify key characteristics of a well-managed farm</li> </ol>
<p><b>FFPr 1.4.1: Increased Capacity of Government Institutions</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number of certified government agricultural extension agents and specialists</li> <li>2) Number of government-funded agriculture research and outreach/extension facilities with sufficient infrastructure and supplies, etc.)</li> <li>3) Number or percent of government agriculture specialists who have advanced degrees in their discipline/specialty (agronomy, hydrology,</li> <li>4) Value of government budget/resources available for agricultural research and extension</li> </ol>
<p><b>FFPr 1.4.2: Improved Policy and Regulatory Framework</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number or percent of targeted priority agriculture policies that have been approved/enacted</li> <li>2) Number or percent of targeted priority agriculture policies that have been fully implemented</li> <li>3) Score of agriculture policy reform index (use milestone scale to track selected/targeted policy</li> </ol>

FFPr Framework #1: Illustrative Indicators
<p>or regulatory reforms as each reforms proceeds from initial policy analysis to a fully implemented policy)</p> <p>4) Host government has a fully developed agriculture research policy</p>
<p><b>FFPr 1.4.3: Increased Access to Improved Market Information</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Total number of sources/outlets for agriculture market information (e.g., total Number of newspapers, radio stations, cooperatives/producer associations, etc.)</li> <li>2) Number or percent of agricultural producers who have ready and frequent access to at least one source of current agriculture market information</li> <li>3) Percent of agricultural producers who have accessed current market information in the last week/month, etc.</li> <li>4) Number of cooperatives that regularly provide updated market information to their members</li> <li>5) Number or percent of agricultural producers (farms)/producers in target region who have access to current market information through their cooperatives or producer associations</li> </ol>
<p><b>FFPr 1.4.4: Improved Capacity of Key Groups in the Agriculture Production Sector</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number of producer associations/cooperatives with certified extension officers/agents</li> <li>2) Number or percent of producer associations/cooperatives with trained staff specializing in policy analysis and/or advocacy</li> <li>3) Number or percent of producer associations/cooperatives with economists or market analysts</li> <li>4) Number of members of targeted producer associations/cooperatives</li> <li>5) Value of budget/revenues of targeted producer associations and cooperatives</li> </ol>
<p><b>FFPr 1.4.5: Increased Leverage of Private Sector Resources</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Value of private sector investment/resources supporting agriculture research/extension that is consistent with government priorities</li> <li>2) Number of private sector institutions that are providing monetary or in-kind resources in support of agriculture productivity (e.g., in areas including ag research, market information, agricultural inputs, etc.</li> <li>3) Number of joint public-private initiatives aimed at improved agricultural production and productivity</li> <li>4) Value of joint public-private initiatives aimed at improved agricultural production and productivity</li> </ol>

FFPr Framework #2: Illustrative Indicators
<b>FFPr SO 2: Expanded Trade of Agricultural Products (Domestic, Regional, and International)</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Value of regional (or international) trade in selected agricultural products</li> <li>2) Volume of regional (or international) trade in selected agricultural products</li> <li>3) Value of domestic market for selected agricultural products</li> </ol>
<b>FFPr 2.1: Increased Value Added to Post-Production Agricultural Products</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Average margin between farmgate price and end product(s) price for selected agricultural value chains</li> <li>2) Number of downstream products produced from selected agricultural commodities/input</li> <li>3) Total value of production for all products derived from selected agricultural commodities</li> </ol>
<b>FFPr 2.2: Increased Access to Markets to Sell Agricultural Products</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number of countries to which selected agricultural products are exported</li> <li>2) Number of distinct markets to which selected agricultural products are exported (i.e., to capture multiple markets in a single country; could track by buyer or ports of entry, etc.)</li> <li>3) Number or percent of target markets (existing demand) that are “closed” due to duties and fees</li> </ol>
<b>FFPr 2.3: Improved Transaction Efficiency</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number of days required to trade goods across borders (regional)</li> <li>2) Number of procedures required to trade goods on international markets (imports and exports)</li> <li>3) Cost required to trade goods across borders (actual costs – fees, etc. - and value of required labor, time lost, etc.)</li> <li>4) Number or percent of transactions that are conducted and completed fully online</li> </ol>
<b>FFPr 2.1.1: Improved Quality of Post-Production Agricultural Products</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Volume of agricultural products certified as meeting international standards</li> <li>2) Number of firms/agricultural producers (farms) certified “organic/fair trade” by international buyers</li> </ol>
<b>FFPr 2.1.2: Increased Efficiency of Post-Production Processes</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Average number of days required to move selected agricultural products from purchase of initial inputs to final product (ready for sale)</li> <li>2) Average production cost per unit of output for selected agricultural products (production costs = costs after purchase of inputs)</li> <li>3) Average unit of output per unit of input for selected agricultural products</li> </ol>

FFPr Framework #2: Illustrative Indicators
<p><b>FFPr 2.2.1: Improved Marketing of Agricultural Products</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number or percent of products for selected value chains using specialty labeling</li> <li>2) Number or percent of firms in selected value chains that use advertising to market their products</li> <li>3) Aggregate value of advertising budgets for firms in selected agricultural commodity value chains</li> <li>4) Number or percent of firms in selected value chains that use at least two forms of media to advertise their products (print, radio, TV, web, direct mail, etc.)</li> </ol>
<p><b>FFPr 2.2.2: Improved Linkages Between Buyers &amp; Sellers</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number of international trade missions conducted with host country ag exporters and foreign buyers</li> <li>2) Number of agreements signed (contracts, MOU, etc.) between buyers/sellers through trade promotion events (e.g. missions, fairs, etc.)</li> </ol>
<p><b>FFPr 2.2.3/2.3.1: Improved Market &amp; Trade Infrastructure</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number of port facilities (sea and air) with modern freight handling capability</li> <li>2) Volume of freight handling capacity at port facilities (sea and air)</li> <li>3) Number and/or capacity of cold storage facilities at ports</li> <li>4) Number and/or capacity of refrigerated trucks (or railcars)</li> <li>5) Number and/or capacity of modern warehouses at port facilities</li> <li>6) Number of port facilities with consistent access to electrical power (though grid or generators)</li> </ol>
<p><b>FFPr 2.3.2: Improved Management Practices of Buyer/Seller Groups Within Trade Sector</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number or percent of firms in selected value chains that regularly use market information to inform decisions</li> <li>2) Number or percent of firms in selected value chains that use web-based ordering/invoicing tools</li> <li>3) Number or percent of firms in selected value chains that actively use business/marketing plans</li> </ol>
<p><b>FFPr 2.1.1.1: Increased Adoption of Established Standards by Industry</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number or percent of registered firms in target sectors that obtain certification with international standards related to product quality</li> <li>2) Portion of selected product markets/sectors that are in compliance with international standards for product quality (measured in terms of value)</li> <li>3) Number or percent of registered firms in target sectors that obtain certification with international standards related to labor conditions (or environmental impact, etc.)</li> </ol>

FFPr Framework #2: Illustrative Indicators
<p><b>FFPr 2.1.2.1: Increased Use of Improved Post-Production Processing and Handling Practices</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number of firms in target region using modern equipment to process agriculture products</li> <li>2) Number of farmers surveyed who say they use three or more improved post-production processing practices</li> </ol>
<p><b>FFPr 2.1.2.2: Improved Post-Harvest Infrastructure</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number or percent of agricultural producers (farms) in target region that have a “quality/effective” (modern) crop storage structure on farm</li> <li>2) Number or percent of agricultural producers (farms)/producers in target region that have access to quality/effective off-farm storage for their product</li> <li>3) Number or percent of agricultural producers (farms) in target region that have access to post-harvest processing facilities</li> </ol>
<p><b>FFPr 2.2.3.1 /2.3.1.2: Increased Use of Financial Services</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number or percent of firms in target region who are accessing credit through any type of “formal” financial product (e.g., loans)</li> <li>2) Total value of credit accessed by farmers in target region for investments in post harvest infrastructure (e.g., value of loans issued)</li> <li>3) Per capita value of credit accessed by agricultural producers in target region to make improvements to meet international quality standards</li> </ol>
<p><b>FFPr 2.4.1: Increased Capacity of Government Institutions</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number of government inspectors certified on international agriculture standards/ trade related topics</li> <li>2) Number of government-funded agriculture research and testing facilities with sufficient infrastructure and supplies, etc.)</li> <li>3) Government IT capability sufficient to support market information services (y/n)</li> <li>4) Value of government budget/resources available for trade capacity building of local firms and organizations</li> <li>5) Number of international markets covered by government trade promotion agencies (e.g. buyer research reports, regulations and standards reports, etc.)</li> </ol>
<p><b>FFPr 2.4.2: Improved Policy &amp; Regulatory Framework</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number of customs harmonization procedures implemented with international standards</li> <li>2) Number of duplicative/redundant regulations related to cross-border trade eliminated</li> <li>3) Number of agricultural regulations related to post-harvest and handling procedures vetted or reviewed by the public/industry</li> <li>4) Number or percent of targeted priority agricultural trade policies that have been approved/enacted</li> <li>5) Number or percent of targeted priority agricultural trade policies that have been fully implemented</li> </ol>



**FFPr Framework #2: Illustrative Indicators**

**FFPr 2.4.3: Increased Access to Improved Market Information**

- 1) Total number of sources/outlets for international agriculture market information (e.g., total Number of newspapers, radio stations, cooperatives/producer associations, etc.)
- 2) Number or percent of agricultural producers who have ready and frequent access to at least one source of current agriculture market information
- 3) Percent of agricultural producers who have accessed current market information in the last week/month, etc. (disaggregated by domestic, regional, international)
- 4) Number of cooperatives that regularly provide updated market information to their members
- 5) Number or percent of agricultural producers (farms)/agricultural producers in target region who have access to current market information through their cooperatives or producer associations

**FFPr 2.4.4: Improved Capacity of Key Groups in the Agriculture Production Sector**

- 1) Number of producer associations/cooperatives who are aware of international production and handling standards
- 2) Number or percent of producer associations/cooperatives with trained staff specializing in trade policy analysis and/or advocacy
- 3) Number or percent of producer associations/cooperatives with economists or market analysts
- 4) Number of members of targeted producer associations/cooperatives
- 5) Value of budget/revenues of targeted producer associations and cooperatives

**FFPr 2.4.5: Increased Leverage of Private Sector Resources**

- 1) Value of private sector investment in trade infrastructure consistent with government priorities
- 2) Number of private sector institutions that are providing monetary or in-kind resources in support of trade expansion projects with the government (e.g. market information systems, storage and transportation infrastructure, etc.)
- 3) Number of joint public-private initiatives aimed at expanding trade capacity
- 4) Value of joint public-private initiatives aimed at improved agricultural production and productivity

## FFP Common Phrasing for Activity Indicators

---

Below is a list of common activities found in FFP projects. Activities that focus on one of these areas should have as a minimum the indicators listed. Beneficiaries must always be individuals and not groups. So if a group (cooperative, PTA, etc) is being trained or certified, an indicator that captures the number of individual people helped must be included. This list is not exclusive of activities that can be conducted under FFP.

Activities focused on training or that have a training component:

- Indicator 1- Number of training sessions in (area of training) conducted for (direct beneficiaries)
- Indicator 2- Number of (direct beneficiaries) trained in (area of training)\*

Activities focused on providing money in the form of loans, grants, etc:

- Indicator 1 - Number of (grants, loans, etc) provided to (direct beneficiaries) for (purchase)
- Indicator 2 – Value of (grants, loans, etc) provided to (direct beneficiaries) for (purchase)
- Indicator 3- Number of (direct beneficiaries) receiving (loans or grants)\*, \*\*

Activities that build or rehabilitate buildings, infrastructure, etc:

- Indicator 1 – Number of (thing) to be (built, rehabilitated)
- Indicator 2 – Number of (direct beneficiaries) benefiting from the (building, Rehabilitation) of (thing)
- Indicator 3 – Number of (indirect beneficiaries) benefiting from the (building, Rehabilitation of (thing)\*\*\*

Activities that focus on the creation of groups:

- Indicator 1 – Number of (group) created
- Indicator 2 - Number of (direct beneficiaries) benefiting from the creation of (group)

Activities that focus on creating linkages between people or groups:

- Indicator 1 – Number of (meetings, trade fairs, exchange visits, etc held)
- Indicator 2 – Number of (linkages, relationships, etc) created
- Indicator 3 - Number of (direct beneficiaries) benefiting from attending the (meetings, trade fair, etc)

Activities that focus on the procurement of inputs (seeds, livestock, etc)

- Indicator 1 – (Number, KG, LBS, etc) of (input) procured
- Indicator 2 - Number of (direct beneficiaries) benefiting from the procurement of (input)

Activities that focus on the establishment of demonstration plots, management systems, or any other thing meant to demonstrate new technology:

- Indicator 1 – Number of (thing) planted, created, etc
- Indicator 2 – Number of (direct beneficiaries) benefiting from creation, planting, etc of (thing)

Activities focused on certifying people or groups:

Indicator 1 – Number of (people, groups) certified in (area)

Indicator 2- Number of (direct beneficiaries) certified

Activities focused on creating analysis of markets, businesses, value chains etc for the purpose of strengthening commercial knowledge and planning:

Indicator 1 – Number of (analysis, etc) completed on (area of study)

Indicator 2 - Number of (direct beneficiaries) benefiting from the (analysis, etc)

Indicator 3 – Number of (indirect beneficiaries) benefiting from the (analysis, etc)\*\*\*\*

\*If more than one group of district beneficiaries are being trained, please create an indicator for each group. Ex- teachers, cooks, and principals all trained together would need individual indicators. Ag producers and government officials would also need their own indicator.

\*\*If the number of direct beneficiaries is equal to the number of loans, this indicator is not needed.

\*\*\*If the item being built is to benefit a large group of people and the direct beneficiaries are the employees who built the item, please use the indicator.

\*\*\*\* If the direct beneficiary is a group, then an indirect beneficiary indicator is needed to capture number of persons.

## MCGOVERN-DOLE FEED THE FUTURE REQUIRED INDICATORS

---

These indicators must be entered into agreements exactly as written

Result #	Indicator	Unit of Measure
FTF 1	Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of USDA assistance	Number
FTF 2	Numbers of educational policies, regulations, and/or administrative procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USDA assistance	Number
FTF 3	Number of child health and nutrition policies, regulations and/or administrative procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USDA assistance	Number
FTF 4	Number of social assistance beneficiaries participating in productive safety nets as a result of USDA assistance	Number
FTF 5	Number of people trained in child health and nutrition as a result of USDA assistance	Number

# MCGOVERN-DOLE FEED THE FUTURE

## INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

FTF 1: Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of USDA assistance			
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Number of public-private partnerships in education or nutrition formed during the reporting year due to USDA assistance (<i>i.e.</i> education or nutrition activity, as described below). Private partnerships can be long or short in duration (length is not a criteria for measurement). Partnerships with multiple partners should only be counted once. A public-private alliance (partnership) is considered formed when there is a clear agreement, usually written, to work together to achieve a common objective. There must be either a cash or in-kind significant contribution to the effort by both the public and the private entity. A private entity can be a for-profit entity, an NGO using private funds, a private company, a community group, or a state-owned enterprise which seeks to make a profit (even if unsuccessfully). A public entity can be a donor-funded program participant, a national or sub-national government, or state-owned enterprises which are non-profit.</p> <p>A project may form more than one partnership with the same entity, but this is likely to be rare. In counting partnerships we are not counting transactions with a partner entity; we are counting the number of partnerships formed during the reporting year. Public-private partnerships counted should be only those formed during the current reporting year. Any partnership that was formed in a previous year should be marked as “continuing” (see disaggregation notes below).</p> <p>A nutritional activity includes any activity focused on improving the nutritional content of agricultural products as provided to consumers, develop improved nutritional products, increase support for nutrition service delivery, etc.</p> <p>An educational activity includes any activity focused on improving educational support to improve quality of literacy or any other lower level result in the MGD results framework such as improving access to school supplies and materials, improved school infrastructure, increased access to food, and improved literacy instructional materials.</p>			
<p><b>RATIONALE:</b> The assumption of this indicator is that if more partnerships are formed it is likely that there will be more investment in education or nutrition-related activities. This will help achieve improved literacy and increased use of health and dietary practices which then contribute to the key objective of improving the literacy of school age children and sustaining the benefits made during project implementation to literacy, attendance, and enrollment by graduating the project to the host country.</p>			
INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number: Partnerships	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Output	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Project Length
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> NONE			
<p><b>DATA SOURCE:</b></p> <p><b>WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INICATOR:</b> Data will be collected by program participants.</p>			

FY2014 Food Aid Proposal Guidance: Annex II

HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data should be collected at the project level through observation and records of partnerships created. Partnership agreements should be submitted to USDA and attached in biannual project reports.		
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> Count partnerships attributable to USDA investment in the reporting year as new.		
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>		
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> Yes [4.5.2-12]	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b>

<b>FTF 2:</b> Numbers of educational policies, regulations, and/or administrative procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USDA assistance			
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Number of education enabling environment policies/ regulations/ administrative procedures in the areas of education, including school finance, assessment, teacher recruitment and selection, etc., that:</p> <p>Stage 1: Underwent the first stage of the policy reform process i.e. analysis (review of existing policy/regulation/administrative procedure and/or proposal of new policy/regulations/administrative procedures)</p> <p>Stage 2: Underwent the second stage of the policy reform process. The second stage includes public debate and/or consultation with stakeholders on the proposed new or revised policy/regulation/administrative procedure</p> <p>Stage 3: Underwent the third stage of the policy reform process (policies were presented for legislation/decreet to improve the policy environment for education)</p> <p>Stage 4: Underwent the fourth stage of the policy reform process [official approval (legislation/decreet) of new or revised policy/regulation/administrative procedure by relevant authority]</p> <p>Stage 5: Completed the policy reform process (implementation of new or revised policy/regulation/administrative procedure by relevant authority)</p> <p>To be counted, actions must have, as their ultimate purpose, improving equitable access to or the quality of education services. Count the highest stage completed during the reporting year.</p>			
<p><b>RATIONALE:</b> The indicator measures the number of policies/regulations/administrative procedures in the various stages of progress towards an enhanced enabling environment for education. It includes the development, implementation and enforcement of policies and regulations that support the achievement of one or more results in the MGD framework focused on improving literacy of school-age children.</p>			
INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
<p><b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number: policies, regulations, and/or administrative procedures and supplementary narrative</p>	<p><b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Stages 1 &amp; 2: Output Stages 3, 4 &amp; 5: Outcome</p>	<p><b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Because this indicator tracks individual policies through the disaggregated stages, one should see actual for each stage change over time in certain ways. One should expect the value of disaggregates measuring the earlier stages to decline and the disaggregates measuring later stages of progress to increase as the enabling environment is strengthened (i.e. move from analysis to adoption and implementation of reforms)</p>	<p><b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Project Length</p>
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> None			
<b>DATA SOURCE:</b>			

<p><b>WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INICATOR:</b> Data will be collected by program participants.</p> <p><b>HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED:</b> Data collected at the project-level, through project records of activities and capacity building carried out by the project, observation and analysis of the host government legal status of the various policies being addressed. Policies, legislation, regulations should be submitted to USDA and attached in project reports.</p> <p><b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> Only count policies specifically addressed with USDA assistance.</p> <p>Enter the name of the policy/regulation/administrative procedure and its stage in order to track movement through the stages. Count the highest stage completed during the reporting year.</p> <p>This indicator tracks the policy, regulation, or administrative procedure. Multiple project participants working in the same country or region (with regard to regional policies) may report the same policy, regulation, or administrative procedure as long as the program participant participated in the process and provided assistance to the development, drafting, formation of the law or policy.</p>		
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>		
<p><b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> Yes [4.5.1-24]</p>	<p><b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No</p>	<p><b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> This indicator is similar to FtF Indicator 4.5.1-24 <i>number of policies/regulations/administrative procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USG assistance in each case</i>; however the FtF indicator is focused on the agricultural enabling environment and not education. It is also similar to the F Education Indicator, IIP 2.1 – Basic Education, Indicator Title: <i>number of laws, policies, regulations or guidelines developed or modified to improve equitable access to or the quality of education services.</i></p>



<b>FTF 3: Numbers of child health and nutrition policies, regulations and/or administrative procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USDA assistance</b>			
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> Number of child health and nutrition enabling environment policies/regulations/administrative procedures in the areas of child health and nutrition. Child health may include government health facilities, established procedures, materials, public information, training, nutrition may include public sector investment allocated to nutrition, nutritional content of agricultural products as provided to consumers, nutritional products, nutrition service delivery, etc., as it related to child health and nutrition that:</p> <p>Stage 1: Underwent the first stage of the policy reform process i.e. analysis (review of existing policy/regulation/administrative procedure and/or proposal of new policy/regulations/administrative procedures)</p> <p>Stage 2: Underwent the second stage of the policy reform process. The second stage includes public debate and/or consultation with stakeholders on the proposed new or revised policy/regulation/administrative procedure</p> <p>Stage 3: Underwent the third stage of the policy reform process (policies were presented for legislation/decreed to improve the policy environment for education)</p> <p>Stage 4: Underwent the fourth stage of the policy reform process [official approval (legislation/decreed) of new or revised policy/regulation/administrative procedure by relevant authority]</p> <p>Stage 5: Completed the policy reform process (implementation of new or revised policy/regulation/administrative procedure by relevant authority)</p> <p>Count the highest stage completed during the reporting year.</p>			
<p><b>RATIONALE:</b> The indicator measures the number of policies/regulations/administrative procedures in the various stages of progress towards an enhanced enabling environment for child health and nutrition whose sub-elements are specific policy sectors. It includes the development, implementation and enforcement of policies and regulations that support the achievement of one or more results in the MGD framework focused on increasing use of health and dietary practices.</p>			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<p><b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number: policies, regulations, and/or administrative procedures and supplementary narrative</p>	<p><b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Stages 1 &amp; 2: Output Stages 3, 4 &amp; 5: Outcome</p>	<p><b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Because this indicator tracks individual policies through the disaggregated stages, one should see actual for each stage change over time in certain ways. One should expect the value of disaggregates measuring the earlier stages to decline and the disaggregates measuring later stages of progress to increase as the enabling environment is strengthened (i.e. move from analysis to adoption and implementation of reforms)</p>	<p><b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Project Length</p>
<b>DISAGGREGATION: NONE</b>			

<b>DATA SOURCE:</b> <b>WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INICATOR:</b> Data will be collected by program participants.  <b>HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED:</b> Data collected at the project-level , through project records of activities and capacity building carried out by the project, observation and analysis of the host government legal status of the various policies being addressed. Policies, legislation, regulations should be submitted to USDA and attached in biannual project reports.		
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> Only count policies specifically addressed with USDA assistance.  This indicator tracks the policy, regulation, or administrative procedure. Multiple project participants working in the same country or region (with regard to regional policies) may report the same policy, regulation, or administrative procedure as long as the program participant participated in the process and provided assistance to the development, drafting, formation of the law or policy.		
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>		
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> Yes [4.5.1-24]	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> NONE

<b>FTF 4:</b> Number of social assistance beneficiaries participating in productive safety nets as a result of USDA assistance			
<p><b>NOTE- This indicator is required for all agreements.</b></p> <p><b>DEFINITION:</b> The number of people participating in USDA-supported social assistance programming with productive components aimed at increasing community assets, household assets, or strengthening human capital.</p> <p>Productive safety nets are programs that protect and strengthen food insecure households' physical and human capital by providing regular resource transfers in exchange for time or labor. School feeding programs build human capital as it is used to encourage children's attendance in school and help them benefit from the instruction received. School meals and especially take home rations provided are the resources transferred to assist children in attending school and may offset the opportunity costs to households that may for example rely on their children's income from work. Generally there are three kinds of activities that can provide the foundation of a "productive safety net" program. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Activities which strengthen community assets (e.g. public works, community-organized school feeding programs);</li> <li>• Activities which strengthen human assets (e.g. school feeding, education, nutrition or literacy training, maternal and child health visits such as prenatal and well-baby visits); and/or</li> <li>• Activities which strengthen household assets (e.g. take home rations, livelihood diversification, micro savings and credit)</li> </ul> <p>What sets productive safety nets apart from other social assistance programs is that the assistance—a predictable resource transfer—is provided in exchange for labor or to offset the opportunity cost of an investment of time. For this reason they are sometimes referred to as "conditional" safety net programs. Another difference is an expectation that, over time, individuals or households enrolled in a productive safety net program will "graduate" from that program.</p> <p><b>RATIONALE:</b> Provides information on USDA assistance aimed at increasing self-sufficiency in vulnerable populations. School feeding programs build human capital as it is used to encourage children's attendance in school and help them benefit from the instruction received. School feeding programs as a social safety net provide an explicit or implicit transfer to households of the value of the food distributed. The value of the transfers varies from school snacks to large take-home rations.</p>			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number: People	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Output	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Project Length
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> NONE			
<p><b>DATA SOURCE:</b></p> <p>WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INICATOR: Data will be collected by program participants.</p> <p>HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant administrative records and reports. Program participants should keep detailed lists of all program participants.</p>			
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> NONE			
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>			
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> Yes [3.3.3-15]	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> The definition for the indicator was revised to include relevant examples for MGD. For example, FtF	

FY2014 Food Aid Proposal Guidance: Annex II

		does not list nutrition or school-feeding related examples of productive safety nets.
--	--	---

<b>FTF 5: Number of people trained in child health and nutrition as a result of USDA assistance</b>			
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> This is an output indicator measuring the number of health professionals or others trained or certified in child health and nutrition directly as a result of USDA funding in whole or in part.</p> <p>This includes health professionals, primary health care workers, community health workers, volunteers, non-health personnel trained in child health and child nutrition through USDA-supported programs during the reporting year.</p> <p>Successful completion requires that trainees meet the completion requirements of the structured training program as defined by the program offered. Training should be at least two working days (16 hours) in duration.</p>			
<p><b>RATIONALE:</b> Development of human capacity through training is a major component of USDA-supported health area programs in this element. Training health professionals builds human capital and supports institutional capacity building in countries.</p>			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number: People	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Output	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Project Length
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> NONE			
<p><b>DATA SOURCE:</b></p> <p>WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INICATOR: Data will be collected by program participants.</p> <p>HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant training records and reports. Program participants should keep detailed training lists for all training sessions.</p>			
<p><b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> For this indicator, simply count the training attendance numbers without distinguishing whether the same person received multiple trainings. In that case, that person would be counted several times, which is acceptable for this indicator.</p>			
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>			
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> Yes [3.1.9-1]	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> NONE	

## MCGOVERN-DOLE STANDARD INDICATORS

Result #	Title in MGD Results Framework	Indicator Type	Indicator	Feed the Future?	Unit of Measure
MGD SO1	Improved Literacy of School Aged Children	Outcome	Percent of student (girls/boys) who, by the end of (X years of school or grade X) demonstrate reading comprehension equivalent to their grade level as defined by national standards at USDA supported schools	N	Percent
MGD 1.3	Improved Student Attendance	output	Percent of students (girls/boys) regularly (80%) attending USDA supported classrooms/schools	N	Percent
MGD 1.1.2	Better Access to School Supplies and Materials	output	Number of (school supplies and materials) provided as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number
MGD 1.1.2	Better Access to School Supplies and Materials	output	Number of (direct beneficiaries) benefiting from the provision of school supplies	N	Number
MGD 1.1.5	Increased Skills and Knowledge of School Administrators	Outcome	Percent of school administrators in targeted schools who demonstrate use of new techniques or tools	N	Percent
MGD 1.1.5	Increased Skills and Knowledge of School Administrators	output	Number of school administrators and officials trained or certified as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number
MGD 1.1.4	Increased Skills and Knowledge of Teachers	Outcome	Percent of teachers in target schools who demonstrate use of new and quality teaching techniques or tools	N	Percent
MGD 1.1.4	Increased Skills and Knowledge of Teachers	output	Number of teachers/educators/teaching assistants trained or certified as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number

FY2014 Food Aid Proposal Guidance: Annex II

Result #	Title in MGD Results Framework	Indicator Type	Indicator	Feed the Future?	Unit of Measure
MGD 1.3.3	Improved School Infrastructure	output	Number of (school buildings, classrooms, and latrines) (rehabilitated or constructed) as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number
MGD 1.3.3	Improved School Infrastructure	output	Number of (direct beneficiaries) benefiting from the (rehabilitated or constructed) of (school buildings, classrooms, and latrines) as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number
MGD 1.3.4	Increased Student Enrollment	output	Percentage increase in (girls, boys)enrolled in school as a result of USDA assistance	N	Percent
MGD 1.4.4	Increased Engagement of Local Organizations and Community Groups	output	Number of (Groups) contributing to their school as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number
MGD 1.4.2	Improved Policy or Regulatory Framework	output and outcome	Number of educational policies, regulations and/or administrative procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USDA assistance	Y	Number
MGD 2.7.2	Improved Policy or Regulatory Framework	output and outcome	Number of child health and nutrition policies, regulations and/or administrative procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USDA assistance	Y	Number
MGD 1.2.1.1	Increased Access to Food (school feeding)	output	Number of take-home rations provided to (direct beneficiary) as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number
MGD 1.2.1.1	Increased Access to Food (school feeding)	output	Number of (direct beneficiaries) benefiting from a take home ration as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number
MGD 1.2.1.1	Increased Access to Food (school feeding)	output	Quantity of commodities (tons) provided for take-home rations provided to (direct beneficiary) as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number

FY2014 Food Aid Proposal Guidance: Annex II

Result #	Title in MGD Results Framework	Indicator Type	Indicator	Feed the Future?	Unit of Measure
MGD 1.2.1.1	Increased Access to Food (school feeding)	output	Number of daily school meals (breakfast, snack, lunch) provided to (direct beneficiaries) as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number
MGD 1.2.1.1	Increased Access to Food (school feeding)	output	Number of (direct beneficiaries) benefiting from school meals (breakfast, snack, lunch) as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number
MGD 1.2.1.1	Increased Access to Food (school feeding)	output	Quantity of commodities (tons) provided for school meals provided to (direct beneficiary) as a result of USDA assistance	N	Number
MGD SO1 and SO2	Improved Literacy of School-Aged Children/Increased Use of Health and Dietary Practices	output	Number of total individuals benefiting directly from USDA-funded interventions	N	Number
MGD SO1 and SO2	Improved Literacy of School-Aged Children/Increased Use of Health and Dietary Practices	output	Number of total individuals benefiting indirectly from USDA-funded interventions	N	Number



# MCGOVERN-DOLE STANDARD

## INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

<b>MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1:</b> Improved Literacy of School-Age Children		This indicator is required for all proposals and all agreements.	
		<b>Note:</b> Use this indicator to measure result SO1	
<b>MGD INDICATOR 1:</b> Percent of student (girls/boys) who, by the end of (X years of school or grade X) demonstrate reading comprehension equivalent to their grade level as defined by national standards at USDA supported schools			
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> This indicator measures the percent of boys and girls who demonstrate reading comprehension equivalent to their grade level in accordance with national standards. Testing can occur in accordance with national testing protocols.</p> <p>“Students” - boys and girls- are learners of school-age in formal school environments for the purpose of acquiring academic basic education, knowledge or skills.</p> <p>“USDA supported classrooms/school” is defined as those classrooms or schools that receive direct services from a USDA supported program. Services include, for example, school meals and/or take home rations; subsidies for school books, uniforms, and transportation fees; school enrollment fees; and activities focused on increasing parents’ and communities’ knowledge of the importance of schooling.</p>			
<p><b>RATIONALE:</b> The indicator is useful for measuring the impact of USDA projects in improving the literacy of school aged children.</p>			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Percent	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Outcome	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Length of Project
<p><b>DISAGGREGATION:</b></p> <p>Please disaggregate by inserting into parenthesis area within the indicator the following beneficiary types connected to this activity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Boys</li> <li>Girls</li> </ul> <p>Please add the number of school years or grade for which testing will take place. Please create a separate indicator for all desegregations.</p>			
<p><b>DATA SOURCE:</b></p> <p>WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by program participants.</p> <p>HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Standardized Tests</p>			
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> None			
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>			
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> None	

<b>MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1:</b> Improved Literacy of School-Age Children		<b>MGD 1.3:</b> Improved Student Attendance	
		<b>Note:</b> Use this indicator to measure result 1.3	
<b>MGD INDICATOR 2:</b> Percent of students (girls/boys) regularly (80%) attending USDA supported classrooms/schools			
<b>DEFINITION:</b> This indicator measures the proportion of boys and girls attending school regularly. The indicator goes beyond a one-time measure of attendance collected at a single point in time during the school year and attempts to measure consistent school attendance during a given school year.			
“Students” are learners of school-age in formal or non-formal schools or non-school based settings for the purpose of acquiring academic basic education, knowledge or skills.			
“Regular” school attendance is measured by at least 80% attendance during normal school operating hours during the school year. Regular, nationally recognized school holidays and breaks (i.e. winter/summer) are excluded. Similarly, if the school remains closed for a particular reason (i.e. teacher did not show up or a holiday is declared locally) then the total number of school days should be adjusted. As such, the official total number of school days may not be equal to the <i>actual</i> total number of school days (denominator).			
“USDA supported classrooms/school” is defined as those classrooms or schools that receive direct services from a USDA supported program. Services include, for example, school meals and/or take home rations; subsidies for school books, uniforms, and transportation fees; school enrollment fees; and activities focused on increasing parents’ and communities’ knowledge of the importance of schooling.			
$MGD\ indicator\ 1\ (step\ 1) = \frac{\# \ of \ days \ attended \ during \ the \ school \ year \ * \ 100}{\# \ of \ actual \ school \ days}$			
$MGD\ indicator\ 1\ (step\ 2) = \frac{\# \ of \ students \ with \ at \ least \ 80\% \ attendance \ (step\ 1) \ * \ 100}{\# \ of \ students}$			
<b>RATIONALE:</b> The indicator is useful for measuring the impact of USDA projects in boosting the number students that regularly attend school. The McGovern Dole program legislation targets low-income areas where children's enrollment and attendance in school is low or girls' enrollment and participation in preschool or school is low. Children who regularly attend school are expected to have improved levels of performance in school. Most measures of school attendance measure attendance in the previous school week taken at a single point in time during the school year. However, chronic absenteeism or irregular school attendance during the school year may significantly affect school attendance.			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Percent	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Output	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Annual
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> Please disaggregate by inserting into the parenthesis area within the indicator the following beneficiary types connected to this activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Boys</li><li>Girls</li></ul>			

FY2014 Food Aid Proposal Guidance: Annex II

Please create a separate indicator for all desegregations.		
<b>DATA SOURCE:</b>		
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by program participants.		
HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Individual student data from school/teacher attendance records will be collected and analyzed		
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> None		
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>		
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> None

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Improved Literacy of School-Age Children		MGD 1.1: Improved Quality of Literacy Instruction	
		MGD 1.1.2: Better Access to School Supplies and Materials	
		NOTE: Use this indicator to measure result 1.1 or 1.1.2	
MGD INDICATOR 3: Number of (school supplies and materials) provided as a result of USDA assistance			
DEFINITION: This indicator measures the number or amount of school supplies provided as a result of USDA assistance.			
School supplies and materials include, for example, paper, pencils, chalk, blackboards, desks, books, and teacher instructional and student learning materials such as student workbooks, teacher guidelines, supplementary reading books, educational tapes and CDs, library books, references material in hard or electronic copies, and pacing guides. School must receive direct support from a USDA-funded project.			
RATIONALE: In order to improve the quality of literacy instruction, schools have to have ample school supplies and materials per student, including paper, pencils, chalk, blackboards, desks and books. Without adequate materials teachers will be limited in how and what they can teach, and students will be limited in their ability to practice and learn new literacy skills.			
INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number: Schools	INDICATOR LEVEL: Output	DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better	FREQUENCY OF REPORTING: Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30
DISAGGREGATION: Please disaggregate by inserting into parenthesis area within the indicator the types of school supplies provided. Please create a separate indicator for all desegregations.			
DATA SOURCE: WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by program participants.			
HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant records and reports, school administrator/teacher records.			
MEASUREMENT NOTES: NONE			
RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE			
FtF INDICATOR: No	FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR: No	DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES: None	

<b>MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1:</b> Improved Literacy of School-Age Children		<b>MGD 1.1:</b> Improved Quality of Literacy Instruction <b>MGD 1.1.2:</b> Better Access to School Supplies and Materials	
		NOTE: Use this indicator to measure result 1.1 or 1.1.2	
<b>MGD INDICATOR 4:</b> Number of (direct beneficiaries) benefiting from the provision of school supplies			
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> This indicator measures the number of beneficiaries benefiting from the provision or school supplies provided as a result of USDA assistance.</p> <p>School supplies and materials include, for example, paper, pencils, chalk, blackboards, desks, books, and teacher instructional and student learning materials such as student workbooks, teacher guidelines, supplementary reading books, educational tapes and CDs, library books, references material in hard or electronic copies, and pacing guides. School must receive direct support from a USDA-funded project.</p> <p><b>RATIONALE:</b> In order to improve the quality of literacy instruction, schools have to have ample school supplies and materials per student, including paper, pencils, chalk, blackboards, desks and books. Without adequate materials teachers will be limited in how and what they can teach, and students will be limited in their ability to practice and learn new literacy skills.</p>			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number: Beneficiaries	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Output	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30
<p><b>DISAGGREGATION:</b></p> <p>Please disaggregate by inserting into parenthesis area within the indicator the types beneficiaries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students</li> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• School Officials</li> <li>• Other groups (please define)</li> </ul> <p>Please create a separate indicator for all desegregations.</p>			
<p><b>DATA SOURCE:</b></p> <p>WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by program participants.</p> <p>HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant records and reports, school administrator/teacher records.</p>			
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> NONE			
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>			
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> None	

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Improved Literacy of School-Age Children		MGD 1.1: Improved Quality of Literacy Instruction	
		MGD 1.1.5: Increased Skills and Knowledge of School Administrators	
NOTE: NONE			
MGD INDICATOR 5: Percent of school administrators in targeted schools who demonstrate use of new techniques or tools			
DEFINITION: This indicator measures the adoption and use of improved techniques and tools by school administrators in targeted schools as a gauge of the application of new skills and knowledge gained through training or other activities that support result 1.1.5.			
Unit of Measure: % school administrators, demonstrating # of skills			
RATIONALE: Increasing the skills and knowledge of school administrators builds human capital and supports institutional capacity building in countries. Increasing skills and knowledge of school administrators will support the improved quality of literacy instruction by fostering an environment that promotes quality teaching and that is conducive to student learning.			
INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number: School Administrators	INDICATOR LEVEL: Outcome	DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better	FREQUENCY OF REPORTING: Project Length
DISAGGREGATION: NONE			
DATA SOURCE: WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by program participants.			
HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program observations, site visits, and reports.			
MEASUREMENT NOTES: NONE			
RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE			
FtF INDICATOR: No	FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR: No	DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES: None	

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Improved Literacy of School-Age Children		MGD 1.1: Improved Quality of Literacy Instruction	
		MGD 1.1.5: Increased Skills and Knowledge of School Administrators	
		NOTE: Use this indicator to measure activity(ies) that support result 1.1 or 1.1.5.	
MGD INDICATOR 6: Number of school administrators (trained or certified) as a result of USDA assistance.			
Use this indicator to measure activity(ies) that support result 1.1.5.			
DEFINITION: This is an output indicator measuring the number of school administrators and officials (e.g. principals, superintendents) trained or certified directly as a result of USDA funding in whole or in part.			
School administrators or other education officials (public or private) trained in aspects of their current positions, including areas such as finance, management (e.g. logistics, monitoring, personnel use and support), governance (e.g., legislation, communication, enforcement), infrastructure (e.g. building, supplies) or quality assurance for improving literacy skills.			
RATIONALE: Training school administrators or education officials builds human capital and supports institutional capacity building in countries. Increasing skills and knowledge of school administrators, such as school principals or superintendents, will support the improved quality of literacy instruction by fostering an environment that promotes quality teaching and that is conducive to student learning.			
INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number: Administrators/School Officials	INDICATOR LEVEL: Output	DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better	FREQUENCY OF REPORTING: Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30
DISAGGREGATION: Please disaggregate by inserting into the parenthesis area within the indicator if the number of officials trained is not the same number as certified. Please create a separate indicator for all desegregations.			
DATA SOURCE: WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by program participants.			
HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant training records and reports. Program participants should keep detailed training lists for all training sessions.			
MEASUREMENT NOTES: NONE			
RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE			
FtF INDICATOR: No	FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR: No	DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES: None	

<b>MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1:</b> Improved Literacy of School-Age Children		<b>MGD 1.1:</b> Improved Quality of Literacy Instruction <b>MGD 1.1.4:</b> Increased Skills and Knowledge of School Administrators	
<b>MGD INDICATOR 7:</b> Percent of teachers in target schools who demonstrate use of new and quality teaching techniques or tools			
<b>DEFINITION:</b> This indicator measures the adoption and use of improved techniques and tools by teachers in targeted schools as a gauge of the application of new skills and knowledge gained through training or other activities that support result 1.1.5.  Unit of Measure: % Teachers, demonstrating # of skills			
<b>RATIONALE:</b> Increasing the skills and knowledge of teachers builds human capital and supports institutional capacity building in countries. Increasing skills and knowledge of teachers will support the improved quality of literacy instruction by fostering an environment that promotes quality teaching and that is conducive to student learning.			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number: Teachers	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Outcome	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Project Length
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> NONE			
<b>DATA SOURCE:</b> WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by program participants.  HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program observations, site visits, and reports.			
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> NONE			
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>			
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> None	



<b>MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1:</b> Improved Literacy of School-Age Children		<b>MGD 1.1:</b> Improved Quality of Literacy Instruction <b>MGD 1.1.4:</b> Increased Skills and Knowledge of Teachers	
		NOTE: Use this indicator is to measure the activity(ies) that support result 1.1 or 1.1.4.	
<b>MGD INDICATOR 8:</b> Number of teachers (trained or certified) as a result of USDA assistance			
Use this indicator to measure activity(ies) that support result 1.1.4.			
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> This is an output indicator measuring the number of teachers, trained or certified directly as a result of USDA funding in whole or in part.</p> <p>Teachers, educators, teaching assistants who have successfully completed a pre- or in-services training program to teach in schools or equivalent non-school based settings with USDA support (i.e. scholarships or training program funded in whole or in part with USDA funds).</p>			
<b>RATIONALE:</b> Training school administrators or education officials builds human capital and supports institutional capacity building in countries. Training teachers and/or educators builds human capital and supports institutional capacity building in countries. Training teachers to effectively teach literacy to children of different skill levels is essential to improving the overall quality of instruction.			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number: Teachers	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Output	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30
<p><b>DISAGGREGATION:</b></p> <p>Please disaggregate by inserting into the parenthesis area within the indicator if the number of officials trained is not the same number as certified. Please create a separate indicator for all desegregations.</p>			
<p><b>DATA SOURCE:</b></p> <p>WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by program participants.</p> <p>HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant training records and reports. Program participants should keep detailed training lists for all training sessions.</p>			
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> NONE			
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>			
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> None	

<b>MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1:</b> Improved Literacy of School-Age Children		<b>MGD 1.3:</b> Improved Student Attendance <b>MGD 1.3.3:</b> Improved School Infrastructure	
		NOTE: NONE	
<b>MGD INDICATOR 9:</b> Number of (school buildings, classrooms, and latrines) (rehabilitated or constructed) as a result of USDA assistance			
<b>DEFINITION:</b> This indicator measures the number of classroom/schools/latrines rehabilitated or constructed funded in whole or in part by a USDA project.			
Rehabilitation ranges from cosmetic upgrades such as whitewashing walls, to structural improvements (replacing broken windows, fixing leaking roofs, rebuilding damaged walls or roofs, repairing latrines, and upgrading fixing school kitchens), and mending broken furniture. Latrines/toilets that are repaired must meet set local government standards and should also be counted. Toilets counted are only those that have hand washing facilities within or near the toilets.			
Classrooms are expected to be safe and secure spaces in which organized group learning takes place. Classrooms range from environmentally-appropriate, roofed structures without walls, to traditional four-walled structures with a roof and windows. Latrines/toilets constructed must allow for gender-specific latrines/toilets and must meet host country standards regarding the ratio of students per squat hole.			
If a classroom block is rehabilitated/constructed, the number of classrooms in that block affected by the repair/construction should be counted. This indicator does not include temporary classrooms (such as tents, open spaces set aside for instruction) frequently found in refugee settings.			
<b>RATIONALE:</b> Classrooms of acceptable quality are an essential component of education, making instruction possible, more enjoyable and more acceptable for children. Classroom construction can also encourage parents to send their children to school especially in areas where schools were previously too far away. Schools in flagrant disrepair are a deterrent to attendance, especially for girls, a distraction from instruction, and frequently unsafe and inadequate for teaching and learning inclement weather. Adequate school buildings positively impact school attendance.			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number: Schools/classrooms	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Output	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> Please disaggregate by inserting into parenthesis area within the indicator the following types of buildings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Classrooms</li><li>• Kitchens, cook areas</li><li>• Latrines</li><li>• Other school grounds or school buildings</li></ul> Please create a separate indicator for all desegregations.			

<b>DATA SOURCE:</b>		
WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by program participants.		
HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant records and reports.		
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> Schools should only be counted if they receive direct assistance whether in whole or in part from a USDA project.		
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>		
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> None

<b>MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1:</b> Improved Literacy of School-Age Children		<b>MGD 1.1:</b> Improved Quality of Literacy Instruction <b>MGD 1.1.2:</b> Better Access to School Supplies and Materials	
		NOTE: Use this indicator to measure result 1.1 or 1.1.2	
<b>MGD INDICATOR 10:</b> Number of (direct beneficiaries) benefiting from the (rehabilitated or constructed) of (school buildings, classrooms, and latrines) as a result of USDA assistance			
<b>DEFINITION:</b> This indicator measures the number of beneficiaries benefiting from the (rehabilitation or construction) of (school buildings, classrooms, and latrines) as a result of USDA assistance.			
<b>RATIONALE:</b> Classrooms of acceptable quality are an essential component of education, making instruction possible, more enjoyable and more acceptable for children. Classroom construction can also encourage parents to send their children to school especially in areas where schools were previously too far away. Schools in flagrant disrepair are a deterrent to attendance, especially for girls, a distraction from instruction, and frequently unsafe and inadequate for teaching and learning inclement weather. Adequate school buildings positively impact school attendance.			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number: Beneficiaries	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Output	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> Please disaggregate by inserting into parenthesis area within the indicator the types beneficiaries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students</li> <li>• Teachers</li> <li>• School Officials</li> <li>• Other groups (please define)</li> </ul> Please create a separate indicator for all desegregations.			
<b>DATA SOURCE:</b> WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by program participants.  HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant records and reports, school administrator/teacher records.			
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> NONE			
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>			
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> None	

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Improved Literacy of School-Age Children		MGD 1.3: Improved Student Attendance	
		MGD 1.3.4: Increased Student Enrollment	
		NOTE: Use this indicator to measure result 1.3 or 1.3.4	
MGD INDICATOR 11: Percentage increase in (girls, boys)enrolled in school as a result of USDA assistance			
DEFINITION: This indicator measures the percentage increase in school-age students or learners formally enrolled in school or equivalent non-school based settings for the purpose of acquiring academic basic education skills or knowledge.			
RATIONALE: Student enrollment is typically a precursor to attendance, as children usually must be formally enrolled in order to attend class. In some instances, administrative paperwork, enrollment fees, or other factors can serve as barriers to enrollment. Overcoming such barriers to enrollment is expected to contribute to increases in attendance.			
INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number: Students	INDICATOR LEVEL: Output	DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better	FREQUENCY OF REPORTING: Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30
DISAGGREGATION: Please disaggregate by inserting into parenthesis area within the indicator the following beneficiary types connected to this activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Boys</li><li>Girls</li></ul> Please create a separate indicator for all desegregations.			
DATA SOURCE: WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Data will be collected by program participants.			
HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant records and reports, school/teacher enrollment records.			
MEASUREMENT NOTES: None			
RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE			
FtF INDICATOR: No	FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR: No	DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES: None	

<b>MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1:</b> Improved Literacy of School Aged Children		<b>MGD 1.4.4:</b> Increased Engagement of Local Organizations and Community Groups	
<b>MGD INDICATOR 12:</b> Number of (Groups) contributing to their school as a result of USDA assistance			
<p><b>DEFINITION:</b> A count of PTA, School Management Committee (SMC), or other similar governance bodies for an individual school (or equivalent non-school setting) who meet at least four times during the school year, participate in education activities by meeting with school officials quarterly, contribute to school governance by reviewing all policies and procedures, or in any other way to be more supportive of the school or non-school equivalent education setting.</p> <p>USDA support includes, but is not limited to, direct financial support (grants) and/or training in skills related to serving on a PT, SMC, or equivalent governance body.</p> <p><b>RATIONALE:</b> Support for PTA or other school governance structures are an important way to promote capacity building at the grassroots, local level. Such structures promote opportunities for democracy in action as well as improved local ownership, accountability, and educational quality.</p>			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number: Groups	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Output	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30
<p><b>DISAGGREGATION:</b></p> <p>Please disaggregate by inserting into parenthesis area within the indicator the following group types:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PTAs</li> <li>• SMCs</li> <li>• Other Group (please name)</li> </ul> <p>Please create a separate indicator for all desegregations.</p>			
<p><b>DATA SOURCE:</b></p> <p>WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INICATOR: Data will be collected by program participants.</p> <p>HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data from project, school, community and/or administrative records.</p>			
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES: NONE</b>			
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>			
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> None	

<b>MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1:</b> Improved Literacy of School-Aged Children	<b>MGD 1.4.2</b> Improved Policy or Regulatory Framework		
	NOTE: Use this indicator to measure result 1.4.2		
<b>MDG INDICATOR 13:</b> Numbers of (educational policies, regulations, or administrative procedures) in each of the (stage #) of development as a result of USDA assistance			
<b>DEFINITION:</b> Number of education enabling environment policies/ regulations/ administrative procedures in the areas of education, including school finance, assessment, teacher recruitment and selection, etc., that:  Stage 1: Underwent the first stage of the policy reform process i.e. analysis (review of existing policy/regulation/administrative procedure and/or proposal of new policy/regulations/administrative procedures) Stage 2: Underwent the second stage of the policy reform process. The second stage includes public debate and/or consultation with stakeholders on the proposed new or revised policy/regulation/administrative procedure Stage 3: Underwent the third stage of the policy reform process (policies were presented for legislation/decreed to improve the policy environment for education) Stage 4: Underwent the fourth stage of the policy reform process [official approval (legislation/decreed) of new or revised policy/regulation/administrative procedure by relevant authority] Stage 5: Completed the policy reform process (implementation of new or revised policy/regulation/administrative procedure by relevant authority)  To be counted, actions must have, as their ultimate purpose, improving equitable access to or the quality of education services. Count the highest stage completed during the reporting year.			
<b>RATIONALE:</b> The indicator measures the number of policies/regulations/administrative procedures in the various stages of progress towards an enhanced enabling environment for education. It includes the development, implementation and enforcement of policies and regulations that support the achievement of one or more results in the MGD framework focused on improving literacy of school-age children.			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number: policies, regulations, and/or administrative procedures and supplementary narrative	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Stages 1 & 2: Output Stages 3, 4 & 5: Outcome	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Because this indicator tracks individual policies through the disaggregated stages, one should see actual for each stage change over time in certain ways. One should expect the value of disaggregates measuring the earlier stages to decline and the disaggregates measuring later stages of progress to increase as the enabling environment is strengthened (i.e. move from analysis to	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Annually covering the periods: October 1 – September 30

## FY2014 Food Aid Proposal Guidance: Annex II

		adoption and implementation of reforms)	
<p><b>DISAGGREGATION:</b></p> <p>Please disaggregate by inserting into the parenthesis area within the indicator the following beneficiary types connected to this activity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Type of policy</li> <li>• Stages (1-5) as noted above.</li> </ul> <p>Please create a separate indicator for all desegregations.</p>			
<p><b>DATA SOURCE:</b></p> <p>WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INICATOR: Data will be collected by program participants.</p> <p>HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data collected at the project-level, through project records of activities and capacity building carried out by the project, observation and analysis of the host government legal status of the various policies being addressed. Policies, legislation, regulations should be submitted to USDA and attached in project reports.</p>			
<p><b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> Only count policies specifically addressed and supported with USDA assistance.</p> <p>Enter the name of the policy/regulation/administrative procedure and its stage in order to track movement through the stages. Count the highest stage completed during the reporting year.</p> <p>This indicator tracks the policy, regulation, or administrative procedure. Multiple project participants working in the same country or region (with regard to regional policies) may report the same policy, regulation, or administrative procedure as long as the program participant participated in the process and provided assistance to the development, drafting, formation of the law or policy.</p> <p>Policies, regulations, administrative procedures focused on child health and nutrition outside of the school environment should be counted under MGD Indicator 10.</p>			
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>			
<p><b>FtF INDICATOR:</b></p> <p>Yes [4.5.1-24]</p>	<p><b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b></p> <p>This indicator is similar to FtF Indicator 4.5.1-24 <i>number of policies/regulations/administrative procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USG assistance in each case</i>; however the FtF indicator is focused on the agricultural enabling environment and not education. It is also similar to the F Education Indicator, IIP 2.1 – Basic Education, Indicator Title: <i>number of laws, policies, regulations or guidelines developed or modified to improve equitable access to or the quality of education services.</i></p>	



<b>MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:</b> Increased Use of Health and Dietary Practices		<b>MGD 2.7.2:</b> Increased Policy or Regulatory Framework	
		NOTE: Use this indicator to measure result 2.7.2	
<b>MGD INDICATOR 14:</b> Numbers of (child health and nutrition policies, regulations or administrative procedures) in (stage #)as a result of USDA assistance			
<b>DEFINITION:</b> Number of child health and nutrition enabling environment policies/regulations/ administrative procedures in the areas of child health and nutrition. Child health may include government health facilities, established procedures, materials, public information, training, nutrition may include public sector investment allocated to nutrition, nutritional content of agricultural products as provided to consumers, nutritional products, nutrition service delivery, etc., as it related to child health and nutrition that:			
Stage 1: Underwent the first stage of the policy reform process i.e. analysis (review of existing policy/regulation/administrative procedure and/or proposal of new policy/regulations/administrative procedures			
Stage 2: Underwent the second stage of the policy reform process. The second stage includes public debate and/or consultation with stakeholders on the proposed new or revised policy/regulation/administrative procedure			
Stage 3: Underwent the third stage of the policy reform process (policies were presented for legislation/decreed to improve the policy environment for education)			
Stage 4: Underwent the fourth stage of the policy reform process [official approval (legislation/decreed) of new or revised policy/regulation/administrative procedure by relevant authority]			
Stage 5: Completed the policy reform process (implementation of new or revised policy/regulation/administrative procedure by relevant authority)			
Count the highest stage completed during the reporting year.			
<b>RATIONALE:</b> The indicator measures the number of policies/regulations/administrative procedures in the various stages of progress towards an enhanced enabling environment for child health and nutrition whose sub-elements are specific policy sectors. It includes the development, implementation and enforcement of policies and regulations that support the achievement of one or more results in the MGD framework focused on increasing use of health and dietary practices.			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number: policies, regulations, and/or administrative procedures and supplementary narrative	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Stages 1 & 2: Output Stages 3, 4 & 5: Outcome	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Because this indicator tracks individual policies through the disaggregated stages, one should see actual for each stage change over time in certain ways. One should expect the value of disaggregates measuring the earlier stages to decline and the disaggregates measuring later stages of progress to increase as the enabling environment is	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Annually covering the periods: October 1 – September 30

		strengthened (i.e. move from analysis to adoption and implementation of reforms)	
<p><b>DISAGGREGATION:</b></p> <p>Please disaggregate by inserting into the parenthesis area within the indicator the following beneficiary types connected to this activity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Type of policy</li> <li>• Stages (1-5) as noted above.</li> </ul> <p>Please create a separate indicator for all desegregations.</p>			
<p><b>DATA SOURCE:</b></p> <p>WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INICATOR: Data will be collected by program participants.</p> <p>HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data collected at the project-level , through project records of activities and capacity building carried out by the project, observation and analysis of the host government legal status of the various policies being addressed. Policies, legislation, regulations should be submitted to USDA and attached in biannual project reports.</p>			
<p><b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> Only count policies specifically addressed with USDA assistance.</p> <p>Enter the name of the policy/regulation/administrative procedure and its stage in order to track movement through the stages. Count the highest stage completed during the reporting year.</p> <p>This indicator tracks the policy, regulation, or administrative procedure. Multiple project participants working in the same country or region (with regard to regional policies) may report the same policy, regulation, or administrative procedure as long as the program participant participated in the process and provided assistance to the development, drafting, formation of the law or policy.</p> <p>Policies, regulations, administrative procedures focused on education, including those focused on nutrition in schools, should be counted under MGD Indicator 9.</p>			
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>			
<p><b>FtF INDICATOR:</b></p> <p>Yes [4.5.1-24]</p>	<p><b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b></p> <p>This indicator is similar to FtF Indicator 4.5.1-24 <i>number of policies/regulations/administrative procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USG assistance in each case</i>; however the FtF indicator is focused on the agricultural enabling environment and not education.</p>	

<b>MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1:</b> Improved Literacy of School-Aged Children		<b>MGD 1.2:</b> Improved Attentiveness <b>MGD 1.2.1:</b> Reduced Short-Term Hunger <b>MGD 1.2.1.1:</b> Increased Access to Food (school feeding)	
		NOTE: Use this indicator to measure the activity(ies)that support 1.2, 1.2.1, or 1.2.1.1 To measure result 1.2, 1.2.1, or 1.2.1.1 you must suggest a custom indicator that measures attentiveness/ reduced short term hunger/increased access to food.	
<b>MGD INDICATOR 15:</b> Number of take-home rations provided to (direct beneficiary) as a result of USDA assistance			
Use this indicator to measure activity(ies) that support result 1.2.1.1. To measure result 1.2.1.1, you must suggest a custom indicator.			
<b>DEFINITION:</b> A take-home ration is counted each time it is provided to a student, family, teacher or other person in a USDA supported project.			
Take-home rations transfer food resources to families conditional upon school enrollment and regular attendance of children, especially girls. Rations are given to families typically once a month or once a term. They increase school participation and probably learning. Their effect depends on whether the value of the ration offsets some of the costs of sending the child to school.			
Rations may also be given as an incentive to teachers, or cooks in return for their time or service.			
<b>RATIONALE:</b> School meals, coupled with take home rations, can serve as an effective mechanism for encouraging attendance, particularly among girls and attentiveness in school. Take home rations also increase household access to food in the short term.			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number: Rations	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Output	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> Please disaggregate by inserting into parenthesis area within the indicator the following beneficiary types connected to this activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Boys</li><li>Girls</li><li>Teachers</li><li>Cooks</li><li>School staff</li><li>Other groups (please specify)</li></ul> Please create a separate indicator for all desegregations.			
<b>DATA SOURCE:</b> WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INICATOR: Data will be collected by program participants.			
HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Participating partners will count the total number of take home rations			

FY2014 Food Aid Proposal Guidance: Annex II

at the project level, through reports and program data. For this indicator, count the number of rations without distinguishing whether the same person or family received multiple rations. In that case, the person/family would be counted several times, which is acceptable for this indicator.		
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> The number of school age children receiving school meals is counted under MGD Indicator 12.		
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>		
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> None

<b>MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1:</b> Improved Literacy of School-Aged Children		<b>MGD 1.2:</b> Improved Attentiveness <b>MGD 1.2.1:</b> Reduced Short-Term Hunger <b>MGD 1.2.1.1:</b> Increased Access to Food (school feeding)	
		NOTE: Use this indicator to measure the activity(ies) that support 1.2, 1.2.1, or 1.2.1.1 To measure result 1.2, 1.2.1, or 1.2.1.1 you must suggest a custom indicator that measures attentiveness/ reduced short term hunger/increased access to food.	
<b>MGD INDICATOR 16:</b> Number of (direct beneficiaries) benefiting from a take home ration as a result of USDA assistance			
Use this indicator to measure activity(ies) that support result 1.2.1.1. To measure result 1.2.1.1, you must suggest a custom indicator.			
<b>DEFINITION:</b> A take-home ration is counted each time it is provided to a student, family, teacher or other person in a USDA supported project.			
Take-home rations transfer food resources to families conditional upon school enrollment and regular attendance of children, especially girls. Rations are given to families typically once a month or once a term. They increase school participation and probably learning. Their effect depends on whether the value of the ration offsets some of the costs of sending the child to school.			
Rations may also be given as an incentive to teachers, or cooks in return for their time or service.			
<b>RATIONALE:</b> School meals, coupled with take home rations, can serve as an effective mechanism for encouraging attendance, particularly among girls and attentiveness in school. Take home rations also increase household access to food in the short term.			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number: Rations	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Output	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> Please disaggregate by inserting into parenthesis area within the indicator the following beneficiary types connected to this activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Boys</li><li>Girls</li><li>Teachers</li><li>Cooks</li><li>School staff</li><li>Other groups (please specify)</li></ul> Please create a separate indicator for all desegregations.			
<b>DATA SOURCE:</b> WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INICATOR: Data will be collected by program participants.			

<p><b>HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED:</b> Participating partners will count the total number of take home rations at the project level, through reports and program data. For this indicator, count the number of rations without distinguishing whether the same person or family received multiple rations. In that case, the person/family would be counted several times, which is acceptable for this indicator.</p>		
<p><b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> The number of school age children receiving school meals is counted under MGD Indicator 12.</p>		
<p><b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b></p>		
<p><b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> No</p>	<p><b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No</p>	<p><b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> None</p>

<b>MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1:</b> Improved Literacy of School-Aged Children	<b>MGD 1.2:</b> Improved Attentiveness <b>MGD 1.2.1:</b> Reduced Short-Term Hunger <b>MGD 1.2.1.1:</b> Increased Access to Food (school feeding)		
	NOTE: Use this indicator to measure the activity(ies)that support 1.2, 1.2.1, or 1.2.1.1 To measure result 1.2, 1.2.1, or 1.2.1.1 you must suggest a custom indicator that measures attentiveness/ reduced short term hunger/increased access to food.		
<b>MGD INDICATOR 17:</b> Quantity of commodities (tons) provided for take-home rations provided to (direct beneficiary) as a result of USDA assistance			
Use this indicator to measure activity(ies) that support result 1.2.1.1. To measure result 1.2.1.1, you must suggest a custom indicator.			
<b>DEFINITION:</b> A take-home ration is counted each time it is provided to a student, family, teacher or other person in a USDA supported project.			
Take-home rations transfer food resources to families conditional upon school enrollment and regular attendance of children, especially girls. Rations are given to families typically once a month or once a term. They increase school participation and probably learning. Their effect depends on whether the value of the ration offsets some of the costs of sending the child to school.			
Rations may also be given as an incentive to teachers, or cooks in return for their time or service.			
<b>RATIONALE:</b> School meals, coupled with take home rations, can serve as an effective mechanism for encouraging attendance, particularly among girls and attentiveness in school. Take home rations also increase household access to food in the short term.			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number: Tons	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Output	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> Please disaggregate by inserting into parenthesis area within the indicator the following beneficiary types connected to this activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Boys</li><li>Girls</li><li>Teachers</li><li>Cooks</li><li>School staff</li><li>Other groups (please specify)</li></ul> Please create a separate indicator for all desegregations.			
<b>DATA SOURCE:</b> WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INICATOR: Data will be collected by program participants.			
HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Participating partners will count the total the tons of take home rations			

at the project level, through reports and program data.		
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> Tons of commodities provided		
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>		
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> None



MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Improved Literacy of School-Aged Children	MGD 1.2: Improved Attentiveness MGD 1.2.1: Reduced Short-Term Hunger MGD 1.2.1.1: Increased Access to Food (school feeding)		
	NOTE: Use this indicator for the activity(ies) that support result 1.2, 1.2.1, or 1.2.1.1. To measure result 1.2, 1.2.1, or 1.2.1.1 you must suggest a custom indicator that measures attentiveness/ reduced short term hunger/increased access to food.		
MGD INDICATOR 18: Number of daily school meals (breakfast, snack, lunch) provided to (direct beneficiaries) as a result of USDA assistance			
Use this indicator to measure activity(ies) that support result 1.2.1.1. To measure result 1.2.1.1, you must suggest a custom indicator.			
DEFINITION: A school meal may include a breakfast or lunch meal or a snack provided in the mornings or afternoon during the school period.			
A school meal is counted each time it is provided to a student in a USDA supported project.			
A school feeding program provide meals, where the primary objective is generally to provide breakfast, mid-morning meals, lunch, or a combination (depending on the duration of the school day) to alleviate short-term hunger, increase attention span, facilitate learning, and obviate the need for children to leave the school to find food. School meals can be prepared in schools or in the community, or can be delivered from centralized kitchens. They can be an important source of micronutrients if prepared using fortified commodities, or if micronutrient powder is added during or after preparation.			
RATIONALE: School meals, provided early in the school day to alleviate hunger before or while classes are in session, will help children to be more attentive and improve concentration. Ultimately, these children will be more successful in school and progress further and more quickly. School meals or snacks can also alleviate specific nutritional deficiencies of school-age children. The alleviation of hunger via school meals can be critical to improving the capacity of children to learn.			
INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number: Meals	INDICATOR LEVEL: Output	DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better	FREQUENCY OF REPORTING: Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30
DISAGGREGATION: Please disaggregate by inserting into the parenthesis area within the indicator the following beneficiary types connected to this activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Boys</li><li>Girls</li><li>Teachers</li><li>Cooks</li><li>School staff</li></ul>			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other groups (please specify)</li> </ul> <p>Please also specify the meal type provided. Please create a separate indicator for all desegregations.</p>		
<p><b>DATA SOURCE:</b></p> <p>WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INICATOR: Data will be collected by program participants.</p> <p>HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Participating partners will count the total number of school meals at the project level, through reports and program data. For this indicator, count the number of meals without distinguishing whether the same person received multiple meals. In that case, the person would be counted several times, which is acceptable for this indicator.</p>		
<p><b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> The number of take home rations is counted under MGD Indicator 16.</p>		
<p align="center"><b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b></p>		
<p><b>FtF INDICATOR:</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b></p> <p>None</p>

MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1: Improved Literacy of School-Aged Children	MGD 1.2: Improved Attentiveness MGD 1.2.1: Reduced Short-Term Hunger MGD 1.2.1.1: Increased Access to Food (school feeding)		
	NOTE: Use this indicator for the activity(ies) that support result 1.2, 1.2.1, or 1.2.1.1. To measure result 1.2, 1.2.1, or 1.2.1.1 you must suggest a custom indicator that measures attentiveness/ reduced short term hunger/increased access to food.		
MGD INDICATOR 19: Number of (direct beneficiaries) benefiting from school meals (breakfast, snack, lunch) as a result of USDA assistance			
Use this indicator to measure activity(ies) that support result 1.2.1.1. To measure result 1.2.1.1, you must suggest a custom indicator.			
DEFINITION: A school meal may include a breakfast or lunch meal or a snack provided in the mornings or afternoon during the school period.			
A school meal is counted each time it is provided to a student in a USDA supported project.			
A school feeding program provide meals, where the primary objective is generally to provide breakfast, mid-morning meals, lunch, or a combination (depending on the duration of the school day) to alleviate short-term hunger, increase attention span, facilitate learning, and obviate the need for children to leave the school to find food. School meals can be prepared in schools or in the community, or can be delivered from centralized kitchens. They can be an important source of micronutrients if prepared using fortified commodities, or if micronutrient powder is added during or after preparation.			
RATIONALE: School meals, provided early in the school day to alleviate hunger before or while classes are in session, will help children to be more attentive and improve concentration. Ultimately, these children will be more successful in school and progress further and more quickly. School meals or snacks can also alleviate specific nutritional deficiencies of school-age children. The alleviation of hunger via school meals can be critical to improving the capacity of children to learn.			
INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number: Meals	INDICATOR LEVEL: Output	DIRECTION OF CHANGE: Higher is better	FREQUENCY OF REPORTING: Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30
DISAGGREGATION: Please disaggregate by inserting into the parenthesis area within the indicator the following beneficiary types connected to this activity:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Boys</li><li>Girls</li><li>Teachers</li><li>Cooks</li><li>School staff</li><li>Other groups (please specify)</li></ul>			
Please also specify the meal type provided. Please create a separate indicator for all desegregations.			

<b>DATA SOURCE:</b> WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INICATOR: Data will be collected by program participants.  HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Participating partners will count the total number of school meals at the project level, through reports and program data. For this indicator, count the number of meals without distinguishing whether the same person received multiple meals. In that case, the person would be counted several times, which is acceptable for this indicator.		
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> The number of take home rations is counted under MGD Indicator 16.		
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>		
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> None

<b>MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1:</b> Improved Literacy of School-Aged Children	<b>MGD 1.2:</b> Improved Attentiveness <b>MGD 1.2.1:</b> Reduced Short-Term Hunger <b>MGD 1.2.1.1:</b> Increased Access to Food (school feeding)		
	NOTE: Use this indicator for the activity(ies) that support result 1.2, 1.2.1, or 1.2.1.1. To measure result 1.2, 1.2.1, or 1.2.1.1 you must suggest a custom indicator that measures attentiveness/ reduced short term hunger/increased access to food.		
<b>MGD INDICATOR 20:</b> Quantity of commodities provided for daily school meals (breakfast, snack, lunch) provided to (direct beneficiaries) as a result of USDA assistance			
Use this indicator to measure activity(ies) that support result 1.2.1.1. To measure result 1.2.1.1, you must suggest a custom indicator.			
<b>DEFINITION:</b> A school meal may include a breakfast or lunch meal or a snack provided in the mornings or afternoon during the school period.			
A school meal is counted each time it is provided to a student in a USDA supported project.			
A school feeding program provide meals, where the primary objective is generally to provide breakfast, mid-morning meals, lunch, or a combination (depending on the duration of the school day) to alleviate short-term hunger, increase attention span, facilitate learning, and obviate the need for children to leave the school to find food. School meals can be prepared in schools or in the community, or can be delivered from centralized kitchens. They can be an important source of micronutrients if prepared using fortified commodities, or if micronutrient powder is added during or after preparation.			
<b>RATIONALE:</b> School meals, provided early in the school day to alleviate hunger before or while classes are in session, will help children to be more attentive and improve concentration. Ultimately, these children will be more successful in school and progress further and more quickly. School meals or snacks can also alleviate specific nutritional deficiencies of school-age children. The alleviation of hunger via school meals can be critical to improving the capacity of children to learn.			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number: Tons	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Output	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> Please disaggregate by inserting into the parenthesis area within the indicator the following beneficiary types connected to this activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Boys</li><li>Girls</li><li>Teachers</li><li>Cooks</li><li>School staff</li></ul>			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other groups (please specify)</li> </ul> Please also specify the meal type provided. Please create a separate indicator for all desegregations.		
<b>DATA SOURCE:</b> WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INICATOR: Data will be collected by program participants.  HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Participating partners will count the total amount of tons provided.		
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> The number of take home rations is counted under MGD Indicator 16.		
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>		
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> None

<b>MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1:</b> Improved Literacy of School-Aged Children		<b>NOTE:</b> This indicator must be used in all agreements. It can be included under either strategic objective.			
<b>MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:</b> Increased Use of Health and Dietary Practices					
<b>MDG INDICATOR 21:</b> Total number of individuals benefiting directly from USDA-funded interventions					
<b>DEFINITION:</b> This is an output indicator measuring the number of individuals directly participating in USDA-funded interventions. The individuals must be engaged with a project activity or come into direct contact with a set of interventions (goods or services) provided by the project. This may include for example student’s receiving school meals, teacher/administrator training, family members receiving take home rations or loan recipients.					
Individuals merely contacted or involved in an activity through brief attendance (non-recurring participation) does not count under this indicator.					
This indicator only tracks direct beneficiaries reached with direct USDA assistance (funded in part or in whole by USDA). Individuals should not be double counted. Individuals may receive multiple interventions but should only be counted upon first receipt of project interventions.					
<b>RATIONALE:</b> Tracks access to services and overall project direct beneficiaries.					
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>					
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number: individuals	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Output	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30		
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> NONE					
<b>DATA SOURCE:</b> WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INICATOR: Data will be collected by program participants. HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant beneficiary tracking records and reports.					
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> This indicator provides a unique count of total project beneficiaries. It is linked to other MGD indicators such as MGD indicators 3 and 4 related to school administrator and teacher training and MGD indicator MGD 6 related to student enrollment.					
Only direct beneficiaries should be counted. Indirect beneficiaries should not be counted under this indicator. Individual beneficiaries should come into direct contact or receipt of an intervention or set of interventions (i.e. children who receive school meals, tuition waivers, uniforms, books). Family members benefiting from take home rations would all count but if children in the family also receive school meals they should not be double counted. Further, <i>students</i> who benefit from teacher training should not be counted under this indicator but <i>teachers</i> receiving the training should be counted.					
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>					
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> None			

<b>MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 1:</b> Improved Literacy of School-Aged Children		<b>NOTE:</b> This indicator must be used in all agreements. It can be included under either strategic objective.	
<b>MGD RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2:</b> Increased Use of Health and Dietary Practices			
<b>MDG INDICATOR 22:</b> Total number of individuals benefiting indirectly from USDA-funded interventions			
<b>DEFINITION:</b> This is an output indicator measuring the number of individuals indirectly participating in USDA-funded interventions.			
Individuals should not be double counted. Individuals may receive multiple interventions but should only be counted upon first receipt of project interventions.			
<b>RATIONALE:</b> Tracks access to services and overall project direct beneficiaries.			
<b>INDICATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>UNIT OF MEASURE:</b> Number: individuals	<b>INDICATOR LEVEL:</b> Output	<b>DIRECTION OF CHANGE:</b> Higher is better	<b>FREQUENCY OF REPORTING:</b> Biannually covering the periods: October 1 – March 31 and April 1 – September 30
<b>DISAGGREGATION:</b> NONE			
<b>DATA SOURCE:</b> WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INICATOR: Data will be collected by program participants. HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Data will be collected from program participant beneficiary tracking records and reports.			
<b>MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> Indirect beneficiaries are affected through a plausible attribution to the project activities, for the duration of the award. For example, indirect beneficiaries could be students who have received improved literacy instruction a result of a teacher training activity; or individuals who have benefitted from social mobilization after a malaria prevention campaign.			
For disaggregation, choose the most significant intervention received.			
<b>RELATIONSHIP TO THE FEED THE FUTURE (FtF) INITIATIVE</b>			
<b>FtF INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>FtF WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT INDICATOR:</b> No	<b>DEFINITIONAL AND MEASUREMENT NOTES:</b> None	



# MCGOVERN-DOLE ILLUSTRATIVE INDICATORS

MGD Framework #1: Illustrative Indicators
<b>MGD SO 1: Improved Literacy of School-aged Children</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Percent of students in target schools who pass a standardized literacy test as defined by a country curriculum, standards or agreed-upon by national experts</li> <li>2) Proportion of students who, by the end of the primary cycle, are able to read and demonstrate understanding as defined by a country curriculum, standards or agreed-upon by national experts</li> </ol>
<b>MGD 1.1: Improved Quality of Literacy Instruction</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Percent increase in time spent teaching literacy skills</li> <li>2) Number or percent of teachers who demonstrate improved literacy instruction as identified by supervisors, mentors or coaches</li> <li>3) Number of teachers who devote at least 45 minutes a day to literacy instruction</li> <li>4) Percent increase in the number of teaching days in the school year</li> <li>5) Number of schools where school leadership ensures that instructional time is protected and allocated to focus on curricular and instructional issues, including adding time to the school day as necessary</li> </ol>
<b>MGD 1.2: Improved Attentiveness</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number or percent of students in classrooms identified as inattentive by their teachers (data collected during a single day, at specific intervals)</li> <li>2) Number or percent of students in target schools who indicate they are attentive or very attentive during class/instruction (student survey)</li> </ol>
<b>MGD 1.3: Improved Student Attendance</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number or percent of students at target schools who attend school for at least 90% of regularly scheduled school days (per year)</li> <li>2) Ratio of the total number of student days attended to the total number of student days (actual attendance as a ratio of potential attendance; collect data at each target school allowing for comparison and aggregation)).</li> <li>3) Percent of students in target schools who start grade one and complete the last grade of primary school (cohort survival rate)</li> </ol>
<b>MGD 1.1.1: More Consistent Teacher Attendance</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number or percent of classroom hours teachers spend teaching literacy</li> <li>2) Number or percent of teachers in target schools who attend and teach school at least 90% of scheduled school days per school year</li> <li>3) Number of teachers in target schools who arrive on time 90% of school days</li> <li>4) Average teacher attendance rates (for each school and aggregated)</li> <li>5) Number of incentives provided to increase teacher attendance (i.e. THR, supplies, awards, housing, etc)</li> </ol>

<b>MGD Framework #1: Illustrative Indicators</b>
<p><b>MGD 1.1.2: Better Access to School Supplies &amp; Materials</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number of textbooks or other teaching/learning materials provided w/ USDA assistance</li> <li>2) Number or percent of classrooms in target schools with materials and supplies sufficient for effective instruction over full school year (most recently completed year)</li> <li>3) Portion of school supplies provided by non-government sources (may be most easily measured in terms of value)</li> <li>4) Value of funds and in-kind support provided by non-governmental sources for materials and supplies</li> </ol>
<p><b>MGD 1.1.3: Improved Literacy Instructional Materials</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number or percent of classrooms in target schools with literacy instructional materials (textbooks, workbooks, etc) sufficient for effective instruction</li> <li>2) Number or percent of target schools (or classrooms) with supplemental reading materials available to students</li> <li>3) Number or percent of teachers using the national literacy curriculum and the related instructional materials</li> </ol>
<p><b>MGD 1.1.4: Increased Skills &amp; Knowledge of Teachers</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number of teachers/educators/teaching assistants who successfully completed in-service training or received intensive coaching or mentoring with USDA support</li> <li>2) Number of teachers/educators/teaching assistants who successfully completed pre-service training with USDA support</li> <li>3) Total number of person hours of teachers/educators/teaching assistants who successfully completed pre-service training with USG support</li> <li>4) Number or percent of teachers in target schools with recognized teacher certification credentials</li> </ol>
<p><b>MGD 1.1.5: Increased Skills and Knowledge of School Administrators</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Percent of school administrators ensuring that instructional time is protected and allocated to focus on literacy instruction</li> <li>2) Number or percent of school administrators in target schools with recognized education certification credentials</li> <li>3) Number of person hours of administrators and officials successfully trained</li> </ol>
<p><b>MGD 1.2.1: Reduced Short Term Hunger</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number or percent of students in target schools who regularly consume a meal before or during the school day</li> <li>2) Number or percent of students in target schools who indicate that they are “hungry” or “very hungry” during the school day (collected through a student survey)</li> </ol>
<p><b>MGD 1.2.1.1: Increased Access to Food (School Feeding)</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number or percent of students in target schools consuming daily meals at school</li> <li>2) Percent of school age children in target communities who receive daily meals through school feeding programs</li> <li>3) Number of meals consumed on a daily basis at target schools</li> </ol>

MGD Framework #1: Illustrative Indicators
<p><b>MGD 1.3.1: Increased Economic &amp; Cultural Incentives (Or Decreased Disincentives)</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number and percent of target schools that have separate latrines for boys and girls</li> <li>2) Number or percent of students at target schools who regularly receive take home food rations</li> </ol>
<p><b>MGD 1.3.2: Reduced Health Related Absences</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Average # of school days missed by students due to illness (for each school and in aggregate)</li> <li>2) Number or percent of students in target schools who miss more than 10 school days/yr due to illness</li> </ol>
<p><b>MGD 1.3.3: Improved School Infrastructure</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number of buildings at target schools that are constructed or rehabilitated</li> <li>2) Number classrooms at target schools constructed or repaired</li> <li>3) Number of latrines at target schools constructed or rehabilitated</li> <li>4) Number of kitchens at target schools constructed or rehabilitated</li> <li>5) Number or percent of target schools that have a sufficient number of girls and boys latrines in good repair (sufficient # to be defined as a ratio students per latrine)</li> <li>6) Number or percent of target schools that have a sufficient number of classrooms in good repair (this indicator will use a defined maximum capacity for each classroom to derive its value)</li> </ol>
<p><b>MGD 1.3.4: Increased Student Enrollment</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number or percent of primary school-age children in catchment area of target schools who are enrolled in primary school</li> <li>2) Percent of students enrolled in target schools who enroll for the following school year (similar to persistence rates ... primary school “graduates” are not included)</li> </ol>
<p><b>MGD 1.3.5: Increased Community Understanding of Benefits of Education</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number and percent of parents in target communities who can name at least three benefits of primary education (collected through a survey)</li> <li>2) Number or percent of parents in target communities who are members of PTA (or a similar school-based community group)</li> </ol>
<p><b>MGD 1.4.1: Increased Capacity of Government Institutions</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number of government staff in relevant ministries/offices certified in financial accounting/management</li> <li>2) Standard operating procedures and tools for management and oversight of school feeding programs by relevant government offices are operational (y/n)</li> <li>3) IT system to support food procurement and food distribution/logistics is operational (y/n)</li> <li>4) Number or percent of districts in which food procurement and distribution procedures and infrastructure are in place</li> </ol>

**MGD Framework #1: Illustrative Indicators****MGD 1.4.2: Improved Policy and Regulatory Framework**

- 1) Government has a fully developed national primary education strategy/strategic plan that includes a policy framework (y/n)
- 2) National school feeding policy is operational (y/n)

**MGD 1.4.3: Increased Government Support**

- 1) Value of government budgetary resources allocated for primary education (disaggregate by teacher payroll, infrastructure, materials and supplies, etc)
- 2) Primary education budget as a percent of total government budget
- 3) Number and value government investments in relevant school-based infrastructure (e.g., latrines, kitchens, classrooms)
- 4) Number of national and regional government staff working on literacy curriculum and teaching materials
- 5) Number of “community meetings” organized in target communities by government offices to receive and respond to community concerns related to local schools and education.
- 6) Establishment of a national school feeding unit within the government (y/n)

**MGD 1.4.4: Increased Engagement of Local and Community Groups**

- 1) Number of active community groups focused on issues related to literacy in target communities
- 2) Number or percent of schools in target communities with active PTAs
- 3) Number of events promoting improved literacy that are jointly sponsored by private sector and community groups
- 4) Number of events promoting advocacy on child protection and safety in target schools and communities.

**MGD Framework #2: Illustrative Indicators****MGD SO 2: Increased Use of Health and Dietary Practices**

- 1) Percent of schools with soap and water at a hand washing station commonly used by students
- 2) Number or percent of schools using the available (improved) sanitation facility (latrines)
- 3) Percent of households (or schools) in target communities that store food off the ground
- 4) Number or percent of schools (or households) in target communities that clean cooking and eating equipment, consistent with accepted standards, prior to use
- 5) Number or percent of target schools that use a pest management plan for their food storage facilities
- 6) Number or percent of target schools that clean their latrines at least once a day

MGD Framework #2: Illustrative Indicators
<p><b>MGD 2.1: Improved Knowledge of Health and Hygiene Practices</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number or percent of students in target schools who achieve a passing score on a test of good health and hygiene practices</li> <li>2) Number or percent of parents in target communities who can identify at least three important health/hygiene practices (e.g., use of latrines)</li> <li>3) Number or percent of students (and parents) in target communities who can identify at least one local source of information on good health practices (e.g., community health clinic)</li> </ol>
<p><b>MGD 2.2: Increased Knowledge of Safe Food Prep and Storage Practices</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number or percent of food preparers at target schools who achieve a passing score on a test of safe food preparation and storage.</li> <li>2) Number of mothers (or care providers) in target communities who can identify at least three key practices aimed at safe food preparation (e.g., hand washing before preparation)</li> </ol>
<p><b>MGD 2.3: Increased Knowledge of Nutrition</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number or percent of students in target schools who achieve a passing score on a test of good nutrition and dietary practices</li> <li>2) Number of mothers (or care providers) in target communities who can identify at least three important nutrition or dietary guidelines/recommendations</li> <li>3) Number or percent of food preparers at target schools who achieve a passing score on a test of good nutrition and dietary practices</li> <li>4) Number or percent of students (and parents) in target communities who can identify at least one local source of information on nutrition and diet (e.g., community health clinic)</li> </ol>
<p><b>MGD 2.4: Increased Access to Clean Water and Sanitation</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number or percent of target schools with year round access to a clean and safe water source</li> <li>2) Average ratio of latrines to students at target schools (disaggregate by male/female)</li> <li>3) Number or percent of target schools that have latrines of sufficient quality (in good repair)</li> <li>4) Average (or aggregate) ratio of hand washing stations to students at target schools</li> <li>5) Number or percent of households in target communities with access to a safe water source</li> </ol>

MGD Framework #2: Illustrative Indicators
<p><b>MGD 2.5: Increased Access to Preventative Health Interventions</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number or percent of households in target communities that have a sufficient number of mosquito nets</li> <li>2) Number or percent of households in target communities that have received de-worming tablets during the previous six months</li> <li>3) Number or percent of households in target communities that have received/are receiving vitamin A and/or iron supplements sufficient to produce health benefits</li> <li>4) Number or percent of target schools that have at least a one month supply of soap (hand and dish soap)</li> </ol>
<p><b>MGD 2.6: Increased Access to Requisite Food Prep and Storage Tools and Equipment</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number or percent of target schools with improved food prep and storage equipment</li> </ol>
<p><b>MGD 2.7.1: Increased Capacity of Government Institutions</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number of government staff in relevant ministries/offices certified to monitor the safety of food in school feeding programs (maintain full knowledge skill set)</li> <li>2) Number of government staff in relevant ministries/offices trained and experienced in outreach and awareness raising (e.g., IEC campaigns)</li> <li>3) Number or percent of districts in which government clinic staff include one or more nutrition specialist</li> </ol>
<p><b>MGD 2.7.2: Improved Policy and Regulatory Environment</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Government water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) standards for primary schools are established and operational</li> <li>2) Number or percent of targeted priority preventive health policies that have been fully implemented</li> <li>3) Preventive health and nutrition are fully developed as policy areas in the national health strategy/strategic plan</li> </ol>
<p><b>MGD 2.7.3: Increased Government Support</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Value of government budgetary resources allocated for preventive health care initiatives</li> <li>2) Budget for preventive health care initiatives as a percent of total health care budget (or could use total government budget as the denominator)</li> <li>3) Number of national and regional government staff working on school-based health and nutrition programs</li> </ol>
<p><b>MGD 2.7.4: Increased Engagement of Local Organizations and Community Groups</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Number of public outreach events organized by community groups that focus on improved household level health practices</li> <li>2) Number of nutrition or health initiatives or activities pursued in partnership between government and local community groups</li> <li>3) Number of anti-violence, abuse, and leadership initiatives or activities that focus on girls and women in target schools and communities</li> </ol>

## MGD Common Phrasing for Activity Indicators

---

Below is a list of common activities found in MGD projects. Activities that focus on one of these areas should have as a minimum the indicators listed. Beneficiaries must always be individuals and not groups. So if a group (cooperative, PTA, etc) is being trained or certified, an indicator that captures the number of individual people helped must be included. This list is not exclusive of activities that can be conducted under MGD.

Activities focused on training or that have a training component:

Indicator 1- Number of (training sessions, workshops, etc) in (area of training) conducted for (direct beneficiaries)

Indicator 2- Number of (direct beneficiaries) trained in (area of training)\*

Activities focused on providing money in the form of loans, grants, scholarships, etc:

Indicator 1 - Number of (grants, loans, etc) provided to (direct beneficiaries) for (purpose)

Indicator 2 – Value of (grants, loans, etc) provided to (direct beneficiaries) for (purpose)

Indicator 3- Number of (direct beneficiaries) receiving (loans or grants)\*, \*\*

Activities that build latrines, schools, wells, etc or rehabilitate buildings, infrastructure, etc:

Indicator 1 – Number of (thing) to be (built, rehabilitated)

Indicator 2 – Number of (direct beneficiaries) benefiting from the (building, rehabilitation) of (thing)

Indicator 3 – Number of (indirect beneficiaries) benefiting from the (building, rehabilitation of (thing)\*\*\*

Activities that focus on the creation of groups:

Indicator 1 – Number of (group) created

Indicator 2 – Number of (direct beneficiaries) benefiting from the creation of (group)

Activities that focus on creating partnerships or linkages between people or groups:

Indicator 1 – Number of (meetings, exchanges, visits, etc) held

Indicator 2 – Number of (partnerships, relationships, etc) created

Indicator 3 – Number of (direct beneficiaries) benefiting from attending the (meetings, exchanges, etc)

Activities that focus on the procurement of things such as furniture, supplies, books, cooking utensils, etc:

Indicator 1 – (Number, etc) of (things) provided

Indicator 2 – Number of (direct beneficiaries) benefiting from the provision of (things) \*\*

Activities that focus on the establishment of school gardens, fish ponds, etc:

Indicator 1 – Number of (garden, pond, etc) established or created

Indicator 2 – Number of (direct beneficiaries) benefiting from creation, planting, etc of (thing)

Activities focused on creating policies:

- Indicator 1 – Number of policies (created, drafted, adopted) in (area)
- Indicator 2- Number of (direct beneficiaries) benefiting from the policies

Activities focused on creating needs assessments or other assessments for the purpose of drafting new policies, programs, etc:

- Indicator 1 – Number of (needs assessments) completed on (area of study)
- Indicator 2 - Number of (direct beneficiaries) benefiting from the (assessment, etc)
- Indicator 3 – Number of (indirect beneficiaries) benefiting from the (analysis, etc)\*\*\*\*

Activities focused on holding events to create awareness or pass along information:

- Indicator 1 – Number of (events, radio spots, add campaigns, etc) held
- Indicator 2 – Number of (direct beneficiaries) benefiting from the (event, etc)

Activities that focus on the creation of new programs:

- Indicator 1 – Number of (programs) created
- Indicator 2 – Number of (direct beneficiaries) benefiting from the creation of (program)

Activities that focus on the creation of new written materials:

- Indicator 1 – Number of (workbooks, papers, manuals, etc) created
- Indicator 2 – Number of (workbooks, papers, manuals, etc) distributed
- Indicator 3 – Number of (direct beneficiaries) benefiting from the distribution or creation of (material) \*\*

\*If more than one group of district beneficiaries is being trained, please create an indicator for each group. Ex- teachers, cooks, and principals all trained together would need individual indicators. Ag producers and government officials would also need their own indicator.

\*\*If the number of direct beneficiaries is equal to the indicator 1, this indicator is not needed.

\*\*\*If the item being built is to benefit a large group of people and the direct beneficiaries are the employees who built the item, please use the indicator. Otherwise, indirect beneficiaries are not needed in most cases.